University of Alberta

CURRICULUM STORIES AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS: A NARRATIVE INQUIRY ON COLLEGE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

by

Joan Ellen Patrick

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

Administration of Postsecondary Education

Department of Educational Policy Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 2005

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

0-494-08288-7

Your file Votre référence
ISBN

Our file Notre reference
ISBN

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Dedication

I dedicate this work
to my students,
who remind me of the purpose,
and
to my husband,
who shares the joy.

Abstract

In this narrative inquiry, I reflected upon college instructors' experience with curriculum development through the stories of two primary participants who were in the early stages of their teaching careers at a large urban college. We defined curriculum as all that a student experiences in the learning environment, where instructors' implicit relationship with this experience-as-curriculum is made manifest in their intentions and hopes for the learning experience, and through their enactment of these in the learning environment within and beyond the classroom. Within the inquiry, curriculum development became defined as the interplay of decision-making and intention, hopes and action through which an instructor moves into a closer relationship with the curriculum.

I met each participant over the course of one year in a sequence of informal conversations and formal audio-taped and transcribed interviews of one and a half to two hours in length. They received a list of focusing questions regarding their experiences with college curriculum development prior to our first meeting: subsequent meetings used a reflective process to further explore their unfolding curriculum development stories. From the stories of the two primary participants, and from my own reflections on being a college instructor, I created mini-narratives which were then shared with three experienced instructors at the same college. In my meetings with each of these instructors we shared our own stories of curriculum development and reflected upon the re-storied accounts of our newer colleagues.

Through our reflective exploration of the narratives we identified how these college instructors relied on faculty development activities to learn about curriculum development as well as to

build community to help them navigate through the processes; the use of, and need for, power to engage in curriculum development; the tensions arising from differing philosophical perspectives amongst colleagues who were teaching and developing curriculum together; the impact of institutional and personal commitment on their identity as college instructors and their curriculum development efforts; and the leadership needed and expected in the process of curriculum development. In the end, I learned that these seemingly contextual elements were experienced as central to the curriculum development process itself.

Acknowledgements

I acknowledge, with deep gratitude and sincere appreciation, the contributions made to this work by each of the following people:

Dr. Margaret Haughey, my doctoral supervisor, who I hold in the highest esteem and who I regard as the finest teacher I have ever worked with,

Dr. D. Jean Clandinin and Dr. William Maynes, my supervisory committee members, whose professional work and personal warmth enriched the experience immeasurably,

the candidacy and final exam committee members, whose insight and wisdom graced those important occasions,

my participants, Hannah, John, Alex, Sacha, and Diane, who, along with colleagues throughout my career, have been the teachers I have needed to learn from,

colleagues and friends up and down the hall, whose interest and encouragement carried me forward,

friends, whose patient good humour through the years added much needed balance, and

my family, most particularly my sister Alison Patrick, and my husband A.M.(Tony) Fell, whose love and unwavering support made it possible.

To those mentioned individually above, and to the college and university world I have had the good fortune to live and work in, I will misquote a well-known politician in saying 'it takes a learning community to prepare a graduate'. You are my learning community and I thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose and Interest 1

Beginning My Story 2

Focus of this Work 4

Focusing Questions 4

Background to the Study 5

The Canadian College Context 6

Historical Context 6

Current Context 8

The Alberta Context 10

Historical Context 10

Current Context 14

Institutional Response within the National and Provincial Context 17

Definitions 20

CHAPTER II – A REVIEW OF WRITING IN THE FIELD 23

Writing on Philosophies of Adult Education 24

Liberal and Progressive 24

Behaviourist and Humanist 25

Critical 25

Curriculum Models in Adult Education 27

Models Growing out of Conservative Philosophies 28

Models Growing out of Liberal Philosophies 32

Models Growing out of Socialistic Philosophies 35

Philosophies and Models – Shaping Our Curriculum Stories 38

Writing on College Faculty Development 39

Review of Writing in the Field – A Starting Place for Further Exploration 41

Where I am Coming From 42

Significance and the Need for this Study 43

CHAPTER III – CONDUCTING THE NARRATIVE INQUIRY 45
Choice of Narrative Inquiry 45
The Participants and Our Process Together 47
Assumptions 51
Being in the Field and Creating Field Texts 52
Moving from Field to Research Text 55
Trustworthiness or Wakefulness 56
In Consideration of Ethics 58
Timing of the Study 60
CHAPTER IV – THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE 61
Entering Into the Stories of Curriculum Development Experience 63
Experiences of Power and Curriculum 64
Conversations About Commitment 83
About Philosophy and Curriculum 96
Conversations About Leadership and Expectation 107
Professional Development and Curriculum Understanding 111
Drawing Closure to the Conversations 123
CHAPTER V – REFLECTION ON THE THEMES AND RE-VIEWING
THE LITERATURE 125
The Landscape is Changing 125
A Word on Curriculum Development 128
Faculty Development 129
Faculty Shortfall 131
A Shift to a Learning Paradigm 137
Curriculum Development, Faculty Development and Technology Use 139
Responding to the Challenges 131
Faculty Development and Curriculum Development – A Closure to the
Conversation 140
Leadership 141
The Dean as Curriculum Leader 142
Leadership at the Program Level 144

Instructors as Curriculum Development Leaders 146
Power and the Process of Curriculum Development 147
Philosophy and Curriculum Development 153
Commitment and College Instructors 157
Concluding the Reflections on Themes and Literature 163
CHAPTER VI – REFLECTIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS 165
Reflection on Thematic Integration 165
Personal Reflections – Look Backward, Moving Forward 167
Implications and Suggestions for Further Consideration 172
Instructors as Curriculum Developers 173
Continuous Learning 174
Power to Effect Change in the Curriculum 175
The Expression of Philosophical Orientations 175
Reciprocal Commitment 176
Participatory Academic Leadership 177
REFERENCES 181
APPENDIX A LETTER OF CONSENT – PRIMARY PARTICIPANTS 187
APPENDIX B LETTER OF CONSENT – REFLECTIVE PARTICIPANTS 190

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Categorization of Adult Education Writing by Philosophical Orientation.....28

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The community college movement in Canada has had, as one of its underpinnings, the firmly held belief that teaching is the central mission and mandate of a college. Unlike universities with their tripartite focus on research, teaching, and community service, the role of a community college has historically been a teaching role, primarily in vocational, practical, and applied subject areas.

Given this understanding of the primacy of teaching in the college context, it is important to consider what might constitute preparedness for teaching, what assistance in terms of curriculum preparation or development is provided to people who take up the teaching role, and ultimately what relationships instructors have with the curricula they are employed to teach.

Purpose and Interest

The purpose of this study is to describe and reflect upon two individuals' experience of curriculum development and preparation to teach within a college. My desire to carry out this study was based on my experiences in various educational settings as a student, administrator, director, and most enduringly, as a college instructor. In each role, I have either made decisions myself, or been part of a process where decisions were made with or by others about what needed to be taught and why, how it should be taught and by whom. It seems to me that each decision made reflects belief about what the curriculum is or should be in the given educational setting, and cumulatively is a process of curriculum development. It also seems that this process defines, in some way, the relationship the instructor has with the curriculum.

I believe this process, this series of decisions, is of profound importance to the ultimate goals of any educational endeavour. They are for that reason both important and interesting to me primarily in my role as college instructor, but also as a life long learner,

volunteer, advocate for college education, spouse of a college instructor, and step-parent to learners within the Alberta post-secondary education system.

Beginning my Story

The story of how I came to teach at a college, and my own relationship to the subject I teach and its curriculum may bear resemblance to some instructors' stories, yet differ dramatically from those of others. Mine goes like this...

> *In 1984, I had finished the course work for my master's degree in Educational Administration at The University of Alberta, and I was hired by one of the five regional education consortia established by Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development. My role was to coordinate the offering of credit and non-credit industry related programming from the member institutions in the extended geographical area. At that time there was an array of business programming offered by a community college member of the consortium in the area, including a full-time management certificate program (the first year of a two year diploma) and part-time voluntary sector management courses. In addition to my work coordinating industry related programming, I was subsequently hired on a term contract to develop an introductory management course for the voluntary sector management program that would be offered on an independent study basis. Following the development of the course materials, I was then contracted to teach the course in the region. At around the same time, I was invited to teach an introductory management course in the full-time management certificate program.*
>
> *As I recall, these were two quite different experiences. In the voluntary sector management course I had intimate and recent acquaintance with the curriculum development process, and beyond the text material which had been given to me at the beginning of the development process, felt I had a great deal of latitude to do*

what I felt was right in developing and teaching the course. This was further enhanced by the understanding that while the course had been developed as an independent study module within the program, I was being given the opportunity to teach it as a face to face classroom based course, and as such it did not need to be a direct reproduction of other offerings of the same course. In contrast, the management course was a highly developed, even polished course, with extensive supporting materials and plans for each class within the course. It was to be offered in the consortium's region in a manner consistent with the full-time program in the larger urban centre where the main college was based. The directions given to me for teaching the course were quite clear.

These two experiences suggest quite different possibilities about the expected relationship between me as the instructor and the curriculum I was to teach, despite the fact that both were introductory management courses based on much the same view of management and learning. With the voluntary sector management course, I felt quite appreciative of the responsibility given to me and the affirmation of my capabilities as both an instructor and a manager that it seemed to imply, although at times I was almost overwhelmed by the range of decision making possibilities it entailed on a class by class basis. In comparison, I admired the thought and effort that had gone into developing the management course with its detailed course outline and class-by-class plan. As a new instructor, I recall feeling quite appreciative of that, even a bit relieved perhaps. On reflection, I now realize that I also felt quite distant from the curriculum, as if it were my job to learn someone else's course, and then turn around and teach it.

I now wonder, after nearly 20 years, if the contrast between these two experiences, and in particular my sense of relationship to the curriculum in each, was the genesis of this study. As each new experience with teaching and curriculum development threaded through my subsequent career, my questions about my relationship with curriculum, rather than being satisfactorily answered

and set aside, drew me further into an exploration of what the curriculum is and why, who develops it and how, and what my role as an instructor is in this evolving process of curriculum development.

Focus of this Work

As I sought a deeper understanding of curriculum development as part of the role of a college instructor, I undertook graduate work to explore this area through college instructors' stories of their lived experience in carrying out curriculum development. Numerous questions and curiosities came to mind as I reflected on my own experience and anticipated conversations with my future participants. Some of the things I was curious about are expressed in the following questions that became my way to focus the study within the context provided by the background described and the writing in the field. I saw these as possible entry points to a conversation, or many conversations, that would explore the relationship instructors create and maintain with the curriculum they are bound to teach, that consider the decisions and choices inherent within that relationship, and that recognize and reflect on tensions created and resolutions afforded throughout the ongoing nature of shaping the curriculum within a complex environment.

Focusing Questions

Are the instructors involved in an identified curriculum development process with the institution or program as their courses are created or re-created at some point? What is their role if they are involved at this stage or level, and how do they view that role? For example, do they consider it part of their job? An opportunity? An obligation? Having been part of this process, how then do instructors make the curriculum their own? Do they stay within or go beyond where the process finishes? How do the process and its outcome relate to the connection the instructors feel with their subjects? If so, does it help or hinder the sense of connectedness? How does the process affect their preparation for teaching? What influences the decisions and choices made by the instructors all the way along?

If instructors do not have the experience of working to develop their courses prior to their delivery, either on their own or with others, what is their experience with preparing to teach whatever has been agreed to? Do they feel they develop the curriculum? If so, how? And what does this mean for subsequent preparation to teach, or is it simply seen as preparing to teach? Do they feel empowered to make decisions regarding the curriculum? Why or why not?

What supports do instructors look to in carrying out curriculum development? Where does this support come from, and what is the nature of the support? When is the support needed and does this change over time? Do instructors feel they have access to both appropriate and available supports, i.e., are the resources of the college available to them in their role?

Each of the questions above could well have opened an entire field of study in itself, yet taken as a whole, as an indication of direction, they expressed a desire to explore the experiences of individual instructors and their engagement with the curriculum in their field of teaching. I believe there are, indeed, myriad ways in which this relationship with curriculum unfolds, each story unique to its teller yet resonant, at some level, within the larger educational community.

Background to the Study

In seeking a new understanding of college curriculum development, I have considered broader influences as they currently might be felt by those involved in curriculum development and preparation for teaching. These influences represent, to some degree, the context within which college instructors function when they create and maintain their relationship to their curriculum and their teaching role. I have raised some of these issues in the following sections, and will continue to consider their import as the study unfolds.

Since my first college teaching experience, I have continued to teach for the same institution. In 1987, I moved into the urban centre where the main college campus was located. My primary motivation in moving was to pick up the threads of my graduate work, complete my thesis, and finish my master's degree. I felt lucky that, at the same time, I was also able to continue teaching, at first part-time, then full-time with the college I had been teaching with at the consortium. As I returned to the urban environment, and a significantly larger education setting, I also became increasingly aware of the broader context in which my college and its activities were set, and, to some degree, how social, political, historical, and educational influences were experienced across that landscape.

The Canadian College Context

As background to the study, a description of some of the issues Canadian colleges face provides the larger context within which college instructors take on and carry out their instructional role. While post-secondary education in Canada falls under provincial jurisdiction, trends and influences at the national level and beyond have considerable impact on regional and local college operation.

Historical Context

From 1850 to 1950, universities dominated post-secondary education in Canada, England, and the United States (Ross, 1976, p. 51, as cited in Ruhl, 1995, p. 1).

> This domination of higher education was marked by conservative ideology and curricula devoted to maintaining the existing class structure. The university's position in post-secondary education, however, was dramatically challenged after World War II by a public that demanded educational reform. Although the university remained the major post-secondary force, the social and economic conditions of this period were perfect for the development of a post-secondary alternative to the university. (Ruhl, p. 1)

These social and economic pressures, including a new emphasis on social equality, the rapid expansion of the Canadian industrial base, and the growth of urban centres, brought about an emphasis on the value of higher education (Ruhl, p. 2). Further encouragement

for the growth of post-secondary education, in the form of federal government support, is described by Selman, Cooke, Selman, and Dampier:

> Beginning in the 1950s, and using the 1951 Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences [Massey Commission] as a marker, the federal government also committed itself to the support and development of the provincial post-secondary educational institution, i.e., universities, colleges, and institutes. (1998, p. 236)

Consequently, post-war higher education was forced to change through social influences from the external environment rather than pressure from within the institutions (Ruhl, p. 2), creating an opportune environment for the growth of community colleges. Since the Second World War, and particularly since the 1960s there has been considerable expansion of the post-secondary educational system in terms of vocational technical institutes, community colleges, and institutes (Selman et al., p. 244). Canadian community colleges grew as a force through the 1960s, a period Dennison and Gallagher refer to as a golden age where "public demand for more advanced education and the financial capability of governments in Canada coincided in dramatic fashion" (1986, p. 10). In the background to a study on the mission of community colleges in both the United States and Canada at the end of the twentieth century, Levin (2000) provides an overview of literature on the mission of community colleges in the second half of the twentieth century. He describes three tracks; a curricular focus (academic, vocational, remedial); purpose (individual and community development, social and economic development of the individual; and social stratification and social reproduction), and the educational and training role (pipeline to baccalaureate degrees, job preparation site, place for potential success and failure in society) (¶ 2). While providing description of the diversity of early community college missions, in the later part of the study Levin encapsulates this to mean a mission geared to serving local communities, where community implies all facets and interests of local populations (¶ 41), in contrast to specifically serving the interests of the economy as Levin argues the community college mission has come to represent at the end of the twentieth century.

Current Context

At present the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) reports 150 member institutions, reflecting 90% of existing community colleges in Canada (ACCC, personal communication, July 12, 2004). These member institutions, while broadly known as community colleges, in fact encompass institutions titled college, community college, technical institute, CEJEP, and university college (ACCC, 2004, ¶ 1), and serve 900,000 full-time and 1.5 million part-time students (ACCC, personal communication, July 12, 2004). While historically granting certificates and diplomas, many of the institutions offer some university programming, and a few (particularly those titled university college) are degree granting institutions (ACCC, 2004, ¶ 3).

In examining the mission of community colleges across Canada and the United States, Levin (2000) describes a "shift in the 1990s toward a new vocationalism based on serving the economy, specifically serving the interests of capital by producing labour and reducing public sector spending" (¶ 42). Levin further articulates a second half of the mandate of community colleges consistent with the pattern of previous decades – that of a responsive institution which, in the 1990s, meant being more overtly connected to the marketplace and to the ideologies of the neo-liberal state. As described by Levin,

> community college behaviours resembled those of private business and industry, pursuing competitive grants, relying more and more on private sector for its revenues, privatizing services and education, securing contracts with both the private and public sectors, and simply "economizing": letting financial rationales take precedence over others. (2000, ¶ 44)

The substance, if not the tone, of this shift to an economic mandate is echoed by Ivany (2000) in an article published in *College Canada: The Newsmagazine of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges*. Ivany lays out the impact of globalization as felt in Canada and elsewhere, and further suggests that

> It is within this new world order, one in which Canada faces both opportunity and threat, that community colleges must reshape and revitalize their roles in economic development. This is not new ground for Canada's community college sector . . . many were founded during the economic boom of the early-to-mid

1960s precisely to address the needs of a rapidly expanding manufacturing and service economy. (¶4)

Despite varying degrees of enthusiasm for this emerging college mandate of economic development, Levin, Ivany, and others appear to agree on its existence as a driving force in college education in Canada.

In the time I have been engaged in this inquiry, my sense of who we are and what we do as a college has shifted, in keeping with forces that I feel are visible as I look at this broader context. Some of the activities in our college that have changed our focus reflect a movement to university level programming, while still holding to the labour market responsiveness suggested by Ivany and others. We look west to British Columbia, for example, and see the increase in university colleges, which looks to me to be a strategy to bridge the traditionally different college and university foci. We aim for university programming that takes us into higher level credentialing, historically the purview of a liberal arts institution, and yet we do so seemingly in response to a need for our graduates to have more years of education suited to particular occupational disciplines and employment possibilities.

Over the years fewer of our leaders have been home grown talent – we have administrators who have more experience on this larger landscape, and bring a bigger picture through their career contacts and employment in other parts of Canada. International education initiatives, often conceived of at a national level, or supported by federal funding, also come into our local environment. All of this invites me to explore how these trends on the larger landscape influence my choices as an instructor about the curriculum I teach.

The Alberta Context

Some examination of Alberta as the setting for this inquiry provides a more specific context, and is particularly relevant given the social, economic, and legislative influences on college education in the more localized environment.

Historical Context

The *British North America Act* of 1867, and specifically Section 93, placed education under provincial jurisdiction. Thus, since Alberta became a province in 1905, post-secondary education has developed under close scrutiny of the provincial government (Berghofer and Vladicka, 1980, p. 7, as cited in Ruhl, 1995, p. 1). The University of Alberta, founded under the *Universities Act* of 1906 was the first, and for many years the only, public post-secondary institution in the province. Successive pieces of legislation, including the *School Act* of 1931, the *Public Junior Colleges Act* of 1958, amendments to the *Public Junior Colleges Act* in 1967, and the *Colleges Act* of 1969 moved college growth out from under the jurisdiction and control of the university or local school boards, and toward the development of a system of public colleges located in, and responsive to, the needs of communities across Alberta. Lethbridge Junior College, established in 1957 by the provincial Cabinet through an order-in-council, became Canada's first publicly funded community college, and was soon followed by a number of others, particularly after the 1969 inception of the *Colleges Act*. As described by Berghofer and Vladicka (1980), public colleges, with enrollment more than doubling between 1967 and 1971, were the fastest growing sector of post-secondary education (as cited in Ruhl, p. 9), and by the early 1980s, 12 publicly funded colleges were in operation across Alberta. In the 1980s, a recessionary economy and government fiscal restraint put a halt to increased numbers of colleges, but the development of educational consortia extended the community of the colleges to previously under-served areas of the province. Although the number of students attending college grew, there ensued a period of stability in actual numbers of colleges until 1997, when four government operated institutions (Alberta Vocational Centres) became separate, board governed institutions

under the *Colleges Act*, bringing the number of publicly funded colleges in Alberta to its current 2005 total of fifteen.

Dennison and Gallagher (1980) credit the *Colleges Act* of 1969 with "bringing legitimacy and security to colleges after a stormy period of parochialism and university domination" (p. 22), and describe the varied expectations of these community institutions:

> The public preference was primarily for academic, university-like junior colleges, which would, in the anticipation of many, eventually become degree granting institutions in their own right. The government wanted the new colleges to be education centres which would concentrate on occupational preparation, while also providing access to wider educational opportunity to a broader segment of society - in fact, to democratize post-secondary education. (p. 22)

In negotiating the role of the community college, Dennison and Gallagher state that "firm and deliberate leadership was provided by government, and that the result was the creation of a college system with a plan, a legislated structure, and a rule of procedure ensured through the *Colleges Act*" (p. 22).

This historical background of community colleges in Alberta, and the resultant system with a plan, a legislated structure, and a rule of procedure as described by Dennison and Gallagher suggests a number of influences on curriculum development and program planning within the colleges. Two of the more explicit historical influences include a legislated academic council at each institution, and the formation of the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfers (ACAT).

The *Colleges Act* of 1969 required that each institution have an academic council made up of equal numbers of students, administration, and faculty to discuss and approve issues of an academic nature in the college. During the growth of the college system, these councils were largely involved with approving new programs for core funding by the institution, and for reviewing and approving significant changes (such as access, curricula, or standards) within existing programs. While granted a greater or lesser degree of importance or seriousness depending on the institution, they did form an influence on

curriculum decision making, particularly in times of government spending. As government funds have been restricted or reduced, and institutions have looked elsewhere for revenues, the purpose and vitality of the academic council has diminished in the eyes of many. However, the passage of Bill 43 – The Post-secondary Learning Act through the Alberta Legislature in the Fall of 2003 significantly changed the mandate of the colleges under a new act, and with the possibility of colleges granting full baccalaureate degrees, the role of academic council has returned to the forefront of academic and curriculum development at some Alberta colleges.

The public colleges of Alberta evolved as essentially autonomous board governed organizations, but the development of the Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfers (ACAT) in 1974 formalized a significant relationship between each college and other institutions based on the transfer arrangements among post-secondary institutions. Established as an independent body reporting to the Minister of (then) Advanced Education and Career Development, ACAT's basic objective has been the enlargement of educational opportunities for students, and it has played an active role in both policy development as well as implementation of policy to support transfer arrangements. ACAT declared a "continuing responsibility for facilitating improvement in communications and working relationships among institutions regarding transfer arrangements and the award of transfer credit" (ACAT, 2001, p. 1). While in theory each institution could develop unique curriculum patterns based on local community needs, in practice, institutions were implicitly and explicitly pressured by students, other institutions, and ACAT itself to conform to easily transferable options.

A third significant influence emerging from the historical background of community colleges was the common practise of using local advisory groups for input in the program planning and decision making process. While not a legislated requirement, the use of advisory committees was consistent with the history of local initiatives leading to the inception of the colleges themselves, and the practice of government supporting programs that were responsive to community and local employment needs.

The college I came into in 1984 was very much a child of this generation of educational growth in Alberta. It had first opened its doors to students in 1971, and had grown as a dynamic institution in response to expanding educational needs in Alberta. Programs had been created and delivered in exponential fashion, and colleagues in 1984 told stories of the early days where needs were expressed in the community, and the means were found to deliver programming in response. People were proud of the shoestring-budget college they had nurtured and been part of, and spoke of a can-do attitude that drove decision making about curriculum. Local advisory committees had a strong voice, and were an integral part of the curriculum development process. The resultant college offerings were varied and colourful; as different as the community voices they mirrored.

Even as I grew to know more about the college, and became further invested in its growth and direction, these early stories gave way to more standardized curriculum processes and outcomes. College diploma programs with various numbers of credits, courses, hours and requirements became uniformly 60 credits, with a consistent requirement for English and option or elective offerings. Greater attention was paid to transferability, both between like programs across the province and, increasingly, into university programming. The need to see programs not as terminal, and instead, to create laddering opportunities, became part of our discussion.

As I reflect on it, my early history with the college, and its progress through the mid-1980s, seems increasingly shaped by external influences and by pressure to conform to norms from a broader context than the immediate community. At the same time, the success of the college and with it, growth in program size and student numbers, meant more instructors teaching the same subjects, adding another force to be considered through the curriculum development process. My relationship with the curriculum I taught became subject to pressure from a greater range of influences.

Current Context

The public post-secondary system in Alberta currently (July 2004) includes15 publicly funded colleges, 4 universities, and 2 technical institutes, and operates within the larger context of higher education including 9 private colleges accredited to grant degrees, over 140 private training institutions with programs falling under the *Private Schools Vocational Act*, and 11 degree granting institutions from outside Alberta offering programs within the province (Alberta Learning, 2004). Most recent figures posted on the Alberta Learning Website as of July 2004 are from 2001 – 2002, and indicate that students attending publicly funded colleges account for 43,017 full-time learning equivalents (FLE) out of a total 127,203 FLE from all post-secondary institutions in Alberta. The FLE in reality represents a far greater number of actual people, as not all students carry a full course load (i.e., generally 5 courses or 15 credits per term) although they must maintain at least 3 courses or 9 credits per term to be counted as part of the full-time contingent. According to Alberta Learning, Alberta's publicly funded colleges offer academic upgrading, job readiness, apprenticeship, certificate, diploma, university transfer, and applied degree programs (2004, ¶ 1).

In combination with the shifting mandate of colleges in Canada noted earlier, population projections suggest colleges may expect increasing student numbers and diversity over the next decade and beyond. The February 2003 Statistics Canada report *The Changing Profile of Canada's Labour Force* uses three occupational categories with a corresponding skill level; highly skilled (normally requires a university education), skilled (normally requires college diploma/certificate or apprenticeship training) and low-skilled (normally requires a high school diploma or less) (p. 18). Noting anticipated growth in the skilled category of jobs, as well as in immigration, women, and young workers' participation in the Alberta Workforce (Statistics Canada, 2003, p. 18), Alberta colleges expect a significant impact on traditional programs and student demographics (Grant MacEwan College, 2004, p. 1). It would appear that college instructors can expect, in future, to work with students of significantly greater diversity in terms of age,

experience, and preparedness, and in different levels of college programming and credentialing.

In tandem with the shifting mandate of colleges in Canada discussed earlier, Alberta colleges have moved to greater diversity of funding and revenue sources. However, provincial government policy remains a key determinant of actions undertaken in Alberta's public post-secondary institutions. Since the mid 1990s, a number of public policy initiatives have had profound impact on the structures and processes in Alberta's colleges. In 1994 Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development (AAECD) released a discussion paper entitled *Profile of Adult Learning in Alberta: Current Context and Selected Trends Affecting Public Post-secondary Education and Labour Market Training*. The shift to an increasingly economic mandate was manifest in the trends selected as important to adult learning in Alberta, and listed in the discussion paper's table of contents:

> Rising Participation and Enrolment in Post-Secondary Education...
> Increasing Numbers of High School Graduates...
> Increasing Importance of Adult Education and Life-long Learning...
> Changing Skill Requirements in the Labour Market...
> Increasing Concern over Social Equity Issues...
> Shift in Emphasis in Income Support Programs...
> Changing Nature of Educational Program Provision and Delivery...
> Increasing Demand for University Research...
> Increasing Pressure on Resources... [and]
> Increasing Pressure on Accountability. (AAECD, 1994, p. 2)

Following this discussion paper, AAECD released the policy document *New Directions for Adult Learning in Alberta* (1994), wherein the government identified strategies for achieving the four stated goals of Alberta's adult learning system; accessibility, responsiveness, affordability, and accountability. Significant funding, in the form of access grants, became available to those institutions able to identify and develop new programs that demonstrated an ability to meet the stated goals. Additional funding became available in 1996 in the form of learning enhancement envelopes that awarded institutions grants to carry out specific projects for "enhancing Alberta's adult learning

system through technology" (AAECD, 1996, p. 6). One particular aspect of this pattern that has been emphasized is support for use of technology in the classroom.

> Alberta Learning is developing a Learning and Technology Policy Framework to provide direction and coordination for the use of technology in Alberta's learning system. . . ensuring that investment in technology is consistent with learning system objectives/priorities and optimizes benefits to learners. (May 2003, p. 2)

Another significant influence on community college education in Alberta was the government initiative to develop a system of benchmarks for post-secondary education in the province. Starting as far back as 1993, and fully implemented in 1996-97, key performance indicators (KPIs) were developed with the intention of strengthening the model of performance-based funding, and improving accountability. Since 1997, public institutions in Alberta have received a "report card" which in part influences provincial funding decisions.

Perhaps the most dramatic and significant policy event in post-secondary education in Alberta has been the recent proclamation of a bill to restructure previous acts covering post-secondary education. As described by Alberta Learning on its website July 10, 2004,

> Bill 43, the Post-secondary Learning Act, 2003, was introduced by the Alberta government following a comprehensive review of Alberta's post-secondary education system, which included consultation with MLAs, stakeholders, and members of the public. The Post-secondary Learning Act combines and updates the four separate Acts that govern Alberta's public post-secondary institutions - the Universities Act, the Colleges Act, the Technical Institutes Act, and the Banff Centre Act - into one complete piece of legislation. It sets the stage for taking Alberta's post-secondary system into the future as a system that is accessible, flexible and responsive regardless of where a student chooses to learn.
>
> In addition to combining the four Acts, the Post-secondary Learning Act will:
>
> - Establish the Campus Alberta Quality Council to facilitate the development and expansion of degree-granting opportunities;
> - Give post-secondary institutions greater flexibility to conduct their business so they are better able to respond to the needs of students;
> - Continue to provide students with predictable and manageable tuition fees; and,

- Balance the needs of institutions and communities with the elimination of the power of boards to expropriate land and sets out new requirements for universities when developing land. (Alberta Learning, 2004)

Each of these policy initiatives has had significant influence across the public post-secondary system in general, and specifically in each institution. Through the combination of policy, exhortation, and funding support, the provincial government (specifically [now] Alberta Advanced Education), has changed the face of post-secondary education, in part creating a more market-oriented, employer-focused profile of college education.

Institutional Response within the National and Provincial Context

As a result of influences from their external context, colleges in Alberta have adapted their internal operations in a variety of ways over recent years. While the impact of the trends and influences previously described has been far reaching, the following discussion focuses on those areas of college response that have significant impact on the role of the college instructor.

One of the consequences of the "knowledge economy" as described by Ivany (2000) is the driving up of the "knowledge intensity" of existing occupations, resulting in higher levels of education required for new jobs in that economy (¶ 8, 10). This may account, in part, for the shifting emphasis from vocational preparation in more traditional occupational areas to increased university transfer and degree granting status from colleges in the system. Amongst the remaining career programs, emphasis on technical skill in knowledge based occupations is much in favour, particularly within programs with obvious career laddering potential. The resulting shift in the profile of college faculty has created a more academically prepared, as opposed to vocationally experienced, instructorship.

> *The feel of the college has notably changed, in my perception, with the increased number and proportion of instructors with graduate degrees. The growth in*

faculty numbers has been in university level programming, and these colleagues with master and doctoral degrees profoundly shape the culture of the college and much of what we do. Their curriculum development activity and choice-making accepts as a given that a seamless transfer by their students from the college to university requires curriculum completely acceptable to, therefore strongly shaped by, their university counterparts. On the other hand, in curriculum conversations with career program colleagues, the notion of the curriculum being handed down by the receiving university programs causes concern and a strong sense of difference between themselves and their university studies counterparts.

I recall a conversation, some years ago now, with a colleague who was lamenting the loss of freedom he perceived to be taking place in the college generally, but specifically in terms of his diminished ability to choose what to teach. He was clearly caught between the desire to see students have the educational and employment future they could build for themselves, and the pressure he and his colleagues were feeling to re-direct their curriculum, making the movement of students through the system more efficient. I remember listening as he described how he had joined the college some years before, having been invited to bring his professional expertise into the program. He described how he valued the trust he had been shown, and how he strove, in the interests of the students, to live up to that trust. He spoke of increased pressure on his curriculum to meet several outcomes, and the resultant stricture on his freedom to teach what he thought was important. It was clearly a feeling of grief and loss that he conveyed as he described the perceived withdrawal of this trust, to be bestowed on people with more academic credentials, or outside the institution.

A second significant response with very direct consequences for the teaching role is the trend toward increased numbers of part-time, non-permanent teaching faculty. In an atmosphere where financial accountability is rewarded, and funding is highly contingent on performance as measured against KPIs, institutions seek to remain flexible in their use

of human resources. As faculty salary and benefits constitute the largest line item in every institution's budget, colleges have made extensive use of term-specific teaching faculty in order to keep costs down and limit long term commitments in a rapidly changing economic environment where responsiveness is demanded from institutions. In the covering letter prefacing *New Directions for Adult Learning in Alberta*, Minister of (then) AAECD Jack W. Ady wrote that

> Boards must have the ability to respond to changes in program priorities and financial pressures. I expect the boards of public post-secondary institutions to examine and, if necessary, renegotiate their collective agreements by March 1, 1995 to ensure that they have the flexibility to terminate academic staff, with appropriate compensation, in cases of program redundancy or financial exigency. (1994, p. 2)

Under this direction boards and administration of public colleges across Alberta have sought to ensure significant growth in college activity and student numbers with no such increase (and in fact a proportionate decrease) in full-time permanent teaching faculty.

> *The program I teach in grew rapidly in the mid-1990s as Alberta Government Access funding was granted to support multiple intakes over each year in addition to the traditional fall intake we had always offered. Our student numbers more than doubled, and a number of new instructors joined us to teach in all course areas; however, as this Access funding was conditional, these instructors came in with no permanent position, nor any foreseeable expectation that full-time continuing positions would be created and opened up. I wonder what impact this had on how they approached working with their curriculum...*

A third significant response has been the use of varied technologies to "enhance Alberta's adult learning system" as supported by Alberta Learning. The global trend toward information access and management through digital technology is felt at the college level in various ways, both in terms of administrative functions and academic activity. In addition to content expertise and teaching skills, faculty members have needed to develop and demonstrate proficiency in using varied technologies to reach and communicate with

students, access and transmit information, manage evaluation systems, and maintain student records.

As institutions responsive to their communities, colleges have made use of faculty development and instructional design both historically and currently to respond to pressures from external and internal forces. Institutional faculty development and instructional design systems and processes, developed and supported to a greater or lesser degree in colleges across the Alberta system, have played a sometimes significant part in supporting and influencing faculty members preparing for their role as instructors.

Within the context of global, national, and provincial influences and the resulting institutional responses, college instructors take on and carry out their role. The influences and responses previously cited form part of the backdrop against which instructors make decisions about curriculum. This study of curriculum development and the college instructor is located in one Alberta college within the context described above.

Definitions

The field of education has fostered lively argument about definitions of curriculum and its related terminology. Without desiring to venture into the political turmoil this gives rise to, I will identify the definitions of some of the terminology to be used in this study. These definitions have been chosen in a manner which both reflects congruence with my own view of their meaning as well as the use of the term in the setting for this study. I have also indicated where these may not be the same, in which case I have indicated both my own understanding of the term or a definition that I find meaningful, as well as the accepted use of the term in the institution of study.

For the purposes of this research, the term *curriculum* may be said to have a fluid definition in the institution of study; there is no official document where curriculum is defined, nor would I be likely to get agreement amongst even the smallest number of my

colleagues were I to ask for their definition of the word curriculum, although we would all probably agree that we are involved with it each day! Use of the term ranges from an extremely narrow interpretation: "a listing of required topics within a credit course", to the breadth suggested by the report from a task force on college curriculum in the institution which stated "the college is the curriculum." My own use of the word certainly tends toward the latter. I believe the curriculum to be all that a student experiences in the learning environment, and each instructor has an implicit relationship with this experience-as-curriculum manifest in their intentions and hopes for the learning experience, and their enactment of these in the learning environment within and beyond the classroom.

Curriculum Development is generally characterized at the college by efforts which are intentional and collaborative, and which focus on making choices about what "needs to be covered," how to "cover it," and how to evaluate student progress, all located within courses and programs of study. The kind of language that often surrounds this work at the college includes words like designing, structuring, organizing, or constructing. These do not particularly fit in my sense of the curriculum as experienced and relationship oriented; throughout the inquiry I will speak of negotiating the curriculum, by which I mean the interplay of decision making and intention, hopes and action, and through which, as an instructor, I move into a closer relationship with the curriculum. My use of the term shaping in reference to the curriculum reflects my sense of the fluid and evolving nature of this relationship, where shaping happens as we move forward or backward and exert or withdraw influence to alter the shape or flow of the curriculum experience. I certainly use the term curriculum development, although in considering my use of language above, I see curriculum development as developing a meaningful relationship with curriculum that will impact positively on the student experience, more than constructing a set of information, activities and outcomes.

Program Planning and *Program Development* are used within the college to indicate larger planning activities, within which curriculum development may fit. Program

planning and development tend to go beyond what might be seen by some as curricular or strictly academic issues to encompass areas of administrative decision making (such as staffing, timetabling, resource allocation, etc). The term *program* is used within the college to denote areas of study or academic disciplines which grant specific credentials, and so use of the term program planning and its associated activities is seen as bounded by the program of studies. I think I would tend to use the term either interchangeably with curriculum development, or even as a subset of curriculum development, as I have difficulty separating administrative decisions that become present in the classroom from my fairly broad understanding of the word curriculum.

Instructional Design is perhaps the only one of these terms to have a more concrete meaning within the institution, perhaps because there is a service area by the name. Their mandate and use of the term relates specifically to instructional strategies and choice of technologies, and the development of materials to support those choices.

For the purposes of this study, the terms *Faculty Member* and *Instructor* or *College Instructor* are used interchangeably.

What will ultimately be significant about these terms within the context of this study is the meaning attached to each by the instructors involved in this study; their understanding of the terms shapes their view of, and influences the relationship they negotiate with, the curriculum they teach.

CHAPTER II: A REVIEW OF WRITING IN THE FIELD

In order to make sense of how faculty members create and maintain a relationship with the curriculum they are employed to teach, some reflection on what has been written about philosophies of adult education, emergent curriculum models that have been developed and used, and the expectation of a role for faculty development in carrying these forward is in order. These areas create the philosophical background and environment within which the question may be examined. As noted by Stark and Lattuca

> Faculty always espouse a philosophy of education (purpose) and a related view of the psychology of learning and teaching, each of which is related to their discipline. Often, however, they do not recognize or make explicit these concepts. (1997, p. 33)

Whether or not instructors are aware of, or in any way knowledgeable about, educational philosophies and curriculum models, I do believe they make decisions that reflect a personal philosophy of teaching and learning, and adopt an (at least implicit) model about how best to plan for teaching their subject – effectively a model of curriculum development. The instructors' stories of their experience in making choices and decisions within the larger context of their surroundings, and the tensions created and lived with through that ongoing process, require an overview of existing literature in the area.

> *Various writings on adult education and curriculum development have been part of the college environment since I first began teaching in it. Whether part of orientation packages, faculty development activities, curriculum revision or approval processes, or professional journals and support material available as resources to both new and seasoned instructors, writing from the field of adult education has, at least in part, heightened the awareness and shaped the views of instructors in the college where I work. I have wondered at times if this is due to the history and growth pattern of community colleges where experts in particular career fields were recruited to be instructors although they may not have had academic or teaching backgrounds. It seems appropriate to consider these*

influences as I seek to learn about the experience of curriculum development by college instructors.

Writing on Philosophies of Adult Education

Current and historical literature on curriculum development may be viewed as coming out of recognized groupings of adult learning philosophies. Various schema or frameworks have been proposed that identify major philosophies with comprehensive categories; two that will be employed here are Merriam and Brockett (1997) and MacKeracher (1996).

Merriam and Brockett (1997, pp. 31-32) present a review of categorizations attempted by various authors, including Apps (1973), who suggest viewing adult education from the philosophies of essentialism, perennialism, progressivism, reconstructionism, and existentialism; Elias and Merriam (1994), who suggest orientations of liberal education, progressivism, humanism, behaviourism, radicalism, and philosophical analysis; and Beder (1989) who identifies three 'traditions': liberal-progressive, countercritique, and personal growth. Merriam and Brockett (1997, p. 32) choose to consider philosophies in three categories; liberal-progressive, behaviourist-humanist, and critical.

Liberal and Progressive

Merriam and Brockett describe liberal education, also called classical humanism and perennialism, as the oldest educational philosophy, and write that "then and now, a liberal adult education perspective values the acquisition of knowledge, the development of a rational perspective, and the ability to analyze critically" (1997, p. 33). As described by Chinien (2001), a liberal philosophy "strives to develop the intellectual capacity of the adult learner, and to broaden one's outlook on the world and incorporate that broader outlook into one's own vision of society" (¶ 12). In contrast, progressivism is described as cooperative problem solving within society through the education of people (Chinien, ¶ 13), reflecting the pragmatism evident in the mid-nineteenth century (Merriam &

Brocket, p. 35). Merriam and Brockett note that "the progressive movement in the United States coincided with the development of the adult education field, and for this reason has had a pervasive impact on adult education" (p. 36). In choosing to link these two educational philosophies, they write that

> Liberal and progressive philosophies also share some similar goals. Both value the development of critical thinking skills, as well as an informed and cultured citizenry who can provide leadership in maintaining and enhancing a democratic society. Where they differ is in the means they use to achieve these ends. Instructional methods, curriculum content, and the role of the teacher and learner clearly differ in these two orientations. (p. 38)

Behaviourist and Humanist

Merriam and Brockett link behaviourism to logical positivism, and argue that

> many concepts and practises in education (including adult education) -such as behavioural objectives, accountability, competency based curricula, instructional design models, and some program planning and evaluation models-are behaviourist in nature. (1997, pp. 38-39)

Behavioural philosophy focuses on a change in behaviour that will comply with a set standard or level of competence (generally established external to the learner) and relies heavily on feedback and reinforcements (Chinien, 2001, ¶11). By comparison, humanism promotes a freedom and autonomy of the learner and focuses on learners' self-development, with the instructor acting as a facilitator and/or partner (Chinien, ¶ 14). Merriam and Brockett suggest that the breadth of humanism and its ability to encompass a number of themes including scientific humanism, Christian humanism, Marxist humanism, and existentialism has led to its popularity as a philosophy for formulating educational practice (p. 39).

Critical

> Critical philosophies share with progressivism a commitment to social change. However, unlike progressives, who base their view on the assumption that the system of democracy is basically good and that change can be brought about by modifying the system, those with critical views tend to see capitalistic and democratic perspectives as fundamentally flawed. The critical perspective, then,

> holds that change can best occur when the existing system is abandoned and replaced with a different perspective. (Merriam & Brockett, p. 43)

The critical or radical philosophy of adult education is described by Chinien as an attempt to bring about societal change through raising the consciousness of the learner to the shortcomings of the society in which the learner lives (¶ 15). Paulo Friere is the most frequently cited example of this philosophy in action, although theorists from critical theory, feminist theory and Marxist theory also emerge from the same thematic background.

I have chosen the Merriam and Brockett framework to summarize major philosophies of adult education in order to represent the range of philosophies with some of the emergent patterns which influence adult education generally, and specifically college curriculum.

Another, more politicized, view of the philosophical makeup of the field of adult education is provided by MacKeracher (1996) who states that "all education is a political enterprise, and its basic principles reflect an underlying political philosophy" (p. 22). MacKeracher uses Baum's (1978) proposed sorting of educational philosophy into conservative, liberal, and socialistic orientations, suggesting that this categorization has the virtues of being practical, informative and relatively easy to understand (p. 22). The conservative philosophical orientation is based on

> an "objective reality". . . one which exists independently of reality created by an individual. Objective reality is based on knowledge proven to be true through empirical or scientific research or divine revelation. (MacKeracher, p. 25)

In contrast, MacKeracher describes the liberal philosophical orientation as

> based on the presupposition that all individuals, in response to their personal life experiences, develop their own personal model of reality representing the meanings and values they have attached to these experiences and the strategies and skills they have developed during them. (p. 25)

While sharing with the liberal orientation the view of multiple realities, the socialistic philosophical orientation is described as

> differ[ing] in that it promotes the correction of those aspects of individual models which are distorted because they are based on lost, repressed, misrepresented, over-simplified, or over-generalized aspects of experience. (MacKeracher, p. 25)

MacKeracher further examines the task of adult education in each orientation, linking the political philosophy of education with the more practical aspects of curriculum development and facilitating adult learning from each perspective.

Curriculum Models in Adult Education

The following overview of curriculum models is organized to reflect their influence from major philosophical approaches to education as represented by the MacKeracher (1996) framework (liberal, conservative, and socialistic) with a correlation to the categorization put forth by Merriam and Brocket (liberal and progressive, behavioural and humanist, and critical philosophies, 1997). My purpose in choosing this configuration stems in part from consideration of the virtues of MacKeracher's framework as suggested by Baum (practical, informative, comprehensible, 1978), but perhaps more importantly, from the view that MacKeracher's examination of the tasks of adult education highlight the relationship between educational philosophy and the role of the college instructor, and finally, because the politicized view suggested through this representation of philosophies and their attendant tasks for adult educators seems in keeping with the historical and current environment described in the preceding discussion of context.

Over the latter third of the 20th century, a variety of curriculum development or program planning models were developed. More specific than the underlying philosophies they sprang from, these models ranged from very generalized principles regarding education of adults, through broad program planning guides, to very specific instructional design methods. Many gained widespread support and were applied and adapted extensively across adult learning environments generally, and the community college system in Alberta specifically. A brief overview of the more well known and influential of these models follows (Table 1).

Table 1. Categorization of Adult Education Writing by Philosophical Orientation

Merriam and Brockett	Behavioural and Humanist	Liberal and Progressive	Critical
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
	Tyler, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* Boone, *Conceptual Programming Model* *Designing a Curriculum* (Dacum) O'Banion, *The Learning College (Outcomes Model)*	Houle, *The Design of Education* Knowles, *Self Directed Learning/Andragogy* Tough, *Self Directed Learning* Caffarella, *Planning Programs for Adult Learners*	Friere, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*

Models Growing out of Conservative Philosophies

There is a strong parallel between MacKeracher's conservative orientation, and the behaviourist philosophies identified by Merriam and Brockett. The following curriculum models appear to emerge from this conservative/behaviourist philosophy.

Ralph Tyler' work, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949, 1971), first published in 1949, and still widely available today, has been deemed a highly dominant influence incurriculum development and program planning models in the second half of the twentieth century. Tyler (1971, as cited in Chinien, 2001) asks 'four questions'

> What educational purposes should the organization seek to attain?
> In attaining these objectives, how can we select learning experiences?
> To maximize effectiveness of instruction, how do we organize the learning experiences?
> How do we evaluate the learning experiences? (¶ 25)

Doll (1998), Langenbach (1988), Merriam and Brockett (1997), and Stark (1997) all identify Tyler with a technical-rational influence on curriculum planning coming out of a behavioural perspective; an influence which has had significant influence on subsequent curriculum planning models, such as Boone's conceptual programming model (Langenbach, p. 207).

Boone's Conceptual Programming Model (1985) is described by Langenbach as "one of the most comprehensive and detailed accounts of activities necessary for successful curriculum development" (p. 207). Boone identifies 3 major stages: planning (including the organization and its renewal process and linking the organization to its publics), design and implementation (including designing the planned program and implementing the planned program), and evaluation and accountability (1985, p. 61, as cited in Langenbach, 1988, p. 195), and moves from the larger macro issues of program planning to the specific micro issues of objective setting and planning for assessment of learner outcomes. As a curriculum development model, Boone's conceptual programming model, with its specificity of objectives and outcomes, is clearly rooted in a conservative/behavioural philosophy of education.

The Designing a Curriculum (Dacum) process was established in the late 1960s in response to the need to solve practical training problems (Mitchell, 1983, ¶ 1), and much of the available writing regarding Dacum comes in the form of manuals and procedural documents, or case studies of institutional use of Dacum. Specifically geared to occupational training, the Dacum process includes job analysis, setting objectives, and designing instruction. Widely used in the development of new programs, or the re-visioning of existing programs in the Alberta college system from the early 1970s to the early to mid-1990s, the Dacum process supports the conservative/behavioural philosophical orientation in curriculum development through a focus on career skill identification and the articulation of measurable learning objectives.

More recently, the focus on objectives has shifted to learning outcomes. With the mandate of community colleges further evolving toward economic development in the 1990s, and the publication of Peter Senge's (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* influencing the educational world, O'Banion (1997) countered with *A Learning College for the 21st Century*. In a companion piece published in *Trustee Quarterly*, and directed at college trustees across North America, O'Banion (1997) described six principles for becoming a learning college; the sixth of which stated that "the learning college and its facilitators succeed only when improved and expanded learning can be documented for its learners" (p. 16). Laying the groundwork for a learning outcomes model of curriculum development, O'Banion states that

> "What does the learner know?" and "What can this learner do" provide the framework for documenting outcomes, both for the learner and the learning facilitators. If the ultimate goal of the learning college is to promote and expand learning, then this is the yardstick by which the learning college and the staff are evaluated. (p. 16)

O'Banion further contends that these outcomes should include competencies required for entry and exit, and that "these competencies reflect national and state standards when available, or they have been developed by specialists on staff or on special contract" (1997, p. 16).

The learning outcomes approach has become a significant and growing process of curriculum development in Alberta colleges, with learning outcomes being developed at both program and institution wide levels in some cases, and often instituted as a requirement for the approval of any new course or program.

The behavioural models of curriculum development referred to above reflect a conservative orientation. MacKeracher (1996) describes education based on this orientation as

> based on the presupposition of the existence of a known and understood objective reality and ultimate truth which should be integrated into the knowledge, values,

> skills, and strategies of each individual within that society or culture. Individuals acquire this objective reality through assimilating standardized public knowledge: acquiring skills and strategies; and accepting, unquestioningly, the approved values. (p. 24)

She suggests that in the conservative orientation, "the task of adult education is to provide learning programs which assist all societal members to learn the basic components of the approved model of reality" (p. 25). MacKeracher further contends that while it is the least widely held orientation in adult education, it does tend to be implicit in programs in which adults learn professional and occupational skills (p. 24). When considered against the historical and current context of the Alberta college system, it would not be surprising if this philosophical orientation and the curriculum development models that arise out of it were much in evidence across the college system, particularly in career programs, and most specifically in those with external professional bodies.

> *Each of the four models overviewed above has had an active presence, implicitly or explicitly, in my teaching experience with the college. Tyler and Boone, with their focus on planning and objectives, organizing of activity, and evaluating results seem to have informed the earliest curriculum materials I came into contact with. Particularly embodied in the structure of the course outline, these rational, behavioural strategies were reinforced each time a course was examined...were the objectives clearly linked to what the employers demanded of our graduates? Were the activities appropriately structured to meet these objectives? Were the students competent and employable? These were accepted as over-arching concerns that needed to be reflected in our entire curriculum.*
>
> *Dacum also had a major role at the college – it was and continues to be the model of choice to create or re-create whole program curricula for career programs. I recall at least three occasions where I was invited to be an observer of this formalized process of calling together occupational leaders and employers, and the process of building a new curriculum from the ground up based on*

necessary competencies for graduates to be successful in the workforce. If this sounds mechanical, indeed it was, from my perspective. There was a certain careful, methodical approach that could be seen as admirable and certainly accountable to the occupational field, but I clearly remember feeling somewhat discomforted by the notion that the place for me as an instructor to add value to the resultant curriculum seemed somewhat limited in scope. Perhaps I wouldn't have felt so constrained if I hadn't witnessed the process!

In the mid to late 1990s the focus on objectives gave way to a focus on creating learning outcomes. Major revision of course outlines reflected the opportunity we took to re-frame old objectives and consider what we taught in terms of an expression of the intended outcomes. While I took part in many discussions that were among the best of times in working with colleagues on curriculum development, there were some processes that might be described as the worst of times as well!

Models Growing Out of Liberal Philosophies

The liberal orientation described by MacKeracher (1996) appears to encompass a fairly wide range of philosophical perspectives, including those Merriam and Brocket (1997) would identify as liberal, humanist, and to some degree progressive, although there may be some overlap with the conservative orientation in Merriam and Brocket's view of progressive philosophy. As described by MacKeracher, this orientation leads to individualized models of reality and behaviour functioning within group defined limits and has a tendency to value the means or processes used in learning rather than the ends of goals (p. 24). The following models of curriculum development, with their learner and social centeredness and adaptability to varied environmental elements emerge from the liberal philosophical orientation.

As noted by Merriam and Brockett (1997, p. 120), accounting for the context of program planning can be traced back to Houle's 1972 classic *The Design of Education*. Houle's

model of adult education includes both major categories of design situations (individual, group, institution, or mass) and components or decision points of the program planning process (1972, as cited in Merriam & Brockett, p. 121; Langenbach, 1988, pp. 180-182). Perhaps in part due to the environmental responsiveness of the model, Houle is sometimes associated with or said to have been significantly influenced by the progressive movement in education (see Merriam & Brocket), although his work is also described by others (Caffarella 2002, Langenbach) as coming out of the humanistic philosophy of education.

Andragogy, with its assumptions about adult learners, underlies Malcolm Knowles' *Self Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers* (1975), in which Knowles contrasts self directed learning with teacher directed learning based on differing definitions, rationale, assumptions, processes, and roles of facilitator/teacher and learner (as cited in Langenbach 1988, pp. 163-164). The set of assumptions andragogy makes about adult learners are contrasted with pedagogy or approaches to childhood learning. Adapted over a number of years of writing, in 1989 Knowles identified these assumptions based on six concepts underlying andragogy; adults need to know why they need to learn something, they have a need to be seen and treated by others as capable of self direction, they come into education with different quality and volume of experience than do youths, adults become ready to learn things they need to know to cope with life, they are life or problem or task oriented in their orientation to learning, and while adults are responsive to some extrinsic motivators, intrinsic motivators are more potent (1989, pp. 83-84, as cited in Merriam & Brockett, p. 136). As a curriculum model in adult education, Langenbach notes that ". . . Knowles' model is primarily prescriptive. Indeed, his text is cast as a source book, as the subtitle indicates, to help learners and teachers better plan for self directed learning" (p. 163).

In contrast to Knowles, Allen Tough's contribution to self directed learning is identified as descriptive, coming out of a series of studies in the 1960s and 1970s (Langenbach, 1988, p. 149; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991, p. 43). Tough described the notion of a

learning episode, as characterized by, and meeting, four criteria; intention to learn, specificity of intent, retention, and priority of learning intention, and further outlined the essential elements of self directed learning, including purposes for learning, deciding to begin, choosing a planner, and advantages and disadvantages (Langenbach, pp. 150-151).

> Andragogy and self-direction in learning have come to define much of what is considered unique to adult education. Self directed learning has, in and of itself, evolved into a major thrust of research and theory building in adult education, and its predominant orientation is humanistic. (Brocket & Hiemstra, 1991; Caffarella, 1993; as cited in Merriam & Brocket, 1997, p. 41)

Both Knowles and Tough, with the learner centeredness indicative of self directed learning, are clearly associated with the liberal philosophical orientation described by MacKeracher (1996).

In *Planning Programs for Adult Learners* (2002), Caffarella outlines a flexible series of eleven components in an interactive model, so called because of the high degree of interactivity between learners, facilitators, planners, and practitioners in the educational endeavour. In this manner Caffarella follows in the tradition of Houle in responsiveness to contextual forces, and of Knowles in learner centeredness. Caffarella's guide has become something of a handbook on curriculum development for Alberta colleges, widely available on campuses and through faculty development offices, perhaps because of its inclusion of all manner of issues related to program planning, and its high degree of flexibility and adaptability to varied student needs, social contexts, and environmental pressures.

The preceding models appear to emerge from what MacKeracher describes as a liberal orientation to education, each including, to some degree, the recognition of an individualized view of reality on the part of the learner, a need for people to form social groups for mutual survival and security, and a willingness to accept, respect, and accommodate individual needs and goals (p. 23).

The shift in our college teaching environment toward a more learner centered focus during the 1990s appears to me as a natural outcome of broader societal interests, signaling the inclusion of more liberal and humanist models of curriculum development. While the college remained committed to student success post-graduation in terms of employment, our process of achieving this outcome seemed to shift to a greater appreciation of learners as self-directed individuals, with varied needs and interests. I remember a colleague, herself a long-term and highly respected faculty member, describing with some humour the college history as going through various eras – first, as a very new college with a high proportion of young pioneering instructors, going through the "faculty-as-god" era. This gave way to the "administrators-as-god" era as the college structure became more formalized and professionally managed. As my friend told the story, she identified the era we were then in as the "student-as-god" era, where the student-centeredness shaped all that we did in our teaching. We agreed that this was a good thing, but that it did require a greater degree of alternatives to be presented in order that individual students might meet their own learning needs in the classroom and beyond. Sadly, this colleague and friend passed away a few years ago. I wish I knew how she might have described the era we are now in, and what impact it has on us as instructors and curriculum developers!

Models Growing Out of Socialistic Philosophies

MacKeracher identifies socialistic philosophies as sharing with liberalism the view of multiple realities, but, in a departure from the liberal view, a socialistic orientation suggests that

> Society itself encourages distortions by valuing some models of reality over others and rejecting or discounting some. Valued models are those of the dominant group. . . the shared model of the dominant group becomes the hegemonic model of reality dominating the views of the entire society. (1996, p. 26)

The task of adult education, from a socialistic perspective, is to

> provide learning programs to assist in the recovery of lost or repressed models and traditions, to raise misrepresented aspects to a conscious level and transform them, and to persuade the larger society to change the dominant model. (MacKeracher, p. 26)

At some level the notion of socialistic or radical or critical theory philosophies being linked to specific models of curriculum development is antithetical. While these philosophies may give rise to counter reactions to the dominant model, the results tend to be context specific and action oriented, and seem unlikely to lead to the development of prescriptive or even descriptive models. Writing in this area is largely case and context specific studies of reaction against models of curriculum development which perpetuate the dominant view.

The most oft cited example of this philosophy in action comes from Paulo Friere's work with the poor in Brazil, which led to the writing of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1970. As noted by Langenbach

> The model of literacy training promulgated by Friere and his followers is not in the form of step one, two, three, etc., but more in the form of criticism of conventional teaching and advocacy of educational ideas and methods that promote liberation. (1988, p. 97)

As such, it exemplifies the critical or radical philosophy of adult education: the purpose of the Friere model is to get learners to question, analyze and act on their environment to change their social, political and economic situation (Chinien, 2001b, ¶ 15). Specifically Friere drew upon teams to first learn as much about the lives of the illiterate people as possible, conceiving of teachers as learners and learners as teachers, creating in effect an education of equals, rather than education that flows from the top down (Langenbach, p. 99).

> Classifying this "model" as an example of an adult literacy curriculum model obviously does not do justice to the larger and intimately related purpose of liberation. But liberation, or elements thereof, can be detected as themes or concerns in other models as well. Learning more about Friere's model can provide insights into curriculum development. The degree to which a curriculum is planned cooperatively, where goals, methods, etc. are negotiated between

> educator and learner may be seen as the degree to which there is genuine concern for liberation as opposed to domestication. (Langenbach, p. 104.)

The concepts of power, dominance, and control appear frequently in work emerging from the socialistic orientation. In an examination of curriculum and concepts of control, Doll (1998) describes the understanding developed in the late 1960s of two curricula – one stated and one hidden – where the stated curriculum "espoused values of democracy, free inquiry, and personal choice; the hidden curriculum, rarely discussed in public, and certainly not printed for distribution, taught conformity, fear of reprisal, obedience to others" (p. 297). Doll credits a number of curriculum theorists with having done much to raise our curriculum consciousness to issues of control through a hidden curriculum, and pays tribute to Michael Apple (1975, 1990), Samuel Gintis (1976), Henry Giroux (1983), Linda McNeil (1986), Peter MacLaren (1989) and Patti Lather (1991) for their contributions to the field. In concluding the essay, Doll argues that

> the "naturalness" of our curriculum and instruction methods - their embedded sense of order and control - is an historical artifact. There is nothing necessary about these methods, they are the result of particular people operating in a particular culture with particular ideologies. Alternatives are allowable. (1998, p. 314)

Response to the notion of curriculum as used to dominate and control often appears to be individualized. Perhaps the innate desire of the instructor coming from a socialistic philosophy to resist or change the dominant model, and to break free of its control, suggests that a socialistic orientation to education will be seen to live at the course or classroom level where an instructor makes decisions to accept, resist, or reject imposed curriculum models.

> *After returning to the city in 1987 to complete my master's degree, and beginning to teach with the college at the campus where the management program was offered, I took advantage of opportunities to meet with colleagues teaching the same courses as I taught. Course coordination meetings took place at fairly regular intervals, and I enjoyed these meetings; talking about our course, our*

preparation, and our teaching. I soon learned that was where decisions about what might be taught and how, what resources would be used, and what evaluation tools should be included would be made. I had become increasingly uncomfortable teaching what seemed like someone else's course and, through my involvement with these meetings and this process, felt able to make or at least influence decisions so that the outcome better reflected what I believed to be good curriculum choices, while maintaining a degree of homogeneity seen as desirable amongst different sections of the same course. Over subsequent years I have acted as course coordinator for three core courses in the program, a role which entailed coordinating these ongoing curriculum development activities within the courses, and in the last nine years have been the program curriculum coordinator, facilitating curriculum development activities on a program wide basis.

Philosophies and Models – Shaping Our Curriculum Stories

The preceding overview of educational philosophies and selected curriculum models suggests a complexity of educational influences that inform us as college faculty members as we make choices and prepare to teach in our subject area. Knowingly or not, we come into and live our professional lives within an educational landscape shaped by these influences. Furthermore, our own philosophical orientation to education implicitly or explicitly shapes our beliefs, desires, actions, and choices about what the curriculum is, ought to be, or needs to become. One outward demonstration of this is our choice of language around the subject of curriculum. The models ascribed above as behavioural or conservative, and their philosophical foundations, give rise to language often used in my environment with respect to curriculum, as noted in the definitions section of this inquiry. The choice of technical and mechanical terms such as designing, structuring, mapping out, sequencing, building, and organizing when working with curriculum resonates with a standards oriented approach to education, most frequently heard in the outcomes-driven diploma programs. I see the liberal or humanist models in evidence amongst areas of the

college more typically associated with a liberal arts education, where the outcomes model of course development, and its associated language, has been quietly and consistently resisted. How these philosophical differences, and their outward manifestation of language and choice or rejection of curriculum development models, live together, and the tensions and possibilities created in this space, are the threads that run through the study and create my curiosity to know more.

Writing on College Faculty Development

Faculty development is one of the institutional supports open to us as instructors in fulfilling our role, and, as such, may play a part in how we understand our relationship to our curriculum. A significant body of writing exists that suggests effective faculty development programs are needed, and are the appropriate institutional response, in attempting to cope with the external and internal pressures on curriculum development and teaching, such as terms of appointment, shifting of college mandate, constrained resources, etc.

> *When I returned to the city and began teaching in the context of an urban campus environment, I soon realized that I was a very little fish swimming in a much bigger pond! I was part of a large contingent of faculty members teaching in the same program area on a daily basis, and with that the number of hallway conversations, students in the classes, and meetings to attend seemed a bit startling at first. At the same time, I soon recognized the benefits to working in the more complex environment. The opportunity to meet with, and learn from, more experienced colleagues was immediately apparent, and I also quickly grew to look forward to faculty development occasions, which happened more frequently and were far more accessible than I had previously experienced. I looked to these opportunities to help make sense of all that I was learning, and valued the college-wide relationships I formed through these activities and events.*

As noted by Alfano in 1993, expectations remained high, at that time, for faculty and staff development programs in community colleges (¶ 2). In a study summarizing strategies for faculty and staff development, Alfano concluded that

> Community colleges currently face some of the most difficult challenges in their history. Increases in student enrollment, diversity, and underpreparedness, combined with decreasing budgets and heavy workloads, have created tremendous pressures on the faculty, staff, and administrators of community colleges. Faculty and staff development projects are sometimes the only avenue to relieve this pressure by allowing community college faculty to link with professional colleagues, to modify and improve instructional material and delivery, and to keep the spark of creativity and enthusiasm alive for themselves and their students. (¶24)

In a more recent review of literature on staff and faculty development practices in community colleges, Foote (1999) identified that

> Due to increasingly diverse student populations, new demands for accountability, more new and part-time faculty, and the changes in information and technology, there is a greater need for staff and faculty training than ever before. Community colleges have met these needs with a variety of programs. (¶ 1)

While numerous studies reflect activities undertaken by faculty and staff development programs, Quick (1999) asserted that

> . . . one goal most have in common is assisting faculty in the development of quality curricula using current and expanded teaching technologies. Faculty development professionals know that the key to building a successful program is to find out what faculty want to accomplish in curriculum development and what assistance they feel they will need to reach their goal. (¶ 2)

Fugate and Amey (2000) linked the needs of the faculty member to their career stage, suggesting that while most college instructors did not foresee an academic career as they entered their own higher education, there were factors that attracted them to a college teaching career and things that caused them to stay (¶ 7). However, their study found that

> for those who select community college instruction as their career, it is seemingly critical that appropriate institutional instructional support be made available especially during the first year . . . without appropriately targeted and tailored instructional support, new community college faculty may be pulled away from the professorate by career opportunities fostered in the private sector. Therefore,

> faculty development and support activities are vehicles for retention as well as professional growth. (¶ 46)

As a result of a series of studies on faculty development in two-year and community colleges in the United States (2000, 1999, 1998), Murray concluded that "it is indeed striking how much has been written about faculty growth and renewal and how few campuses have seen fit to develop comprehensive, systematic programs" (1999, ¶ 2). In a national study of 130 respondent community colleges, Murray (1999) drew a list of six components for effective faculty development programs from a review of the literature. These six included 1) institutional support and a favourable climate; 2) the existence of a formalized, structured development program; 3) connection of faculty development to reward structure; 4) faculty ownership; 5) colleague support; and 6) belief that good teaching is valued by administrators (¶ 6). While concluding that three of the six components were generally present, Murray found "a glaring lack of commitment on the part of the leadership for faculty development" (1999, ¶ 29), with a lack of structured, formalized programs, and a resulting inability for faculty to take ownership of a non-existent program.

Faculty development is so often cited as a key institutional support available to faculty members that I felt it necessary to explore whether instructors do consider it a significant support to them in their curriculum development process.

Review of Writing in the Field – A Starting Place for Further Exploration

In light of the literature on educational philosophy and curriculum development models, and the role these play in shaping the environment the instructor lives within, what do instructors do to make the curriculum their own? How do they do their work while feeling the pressures inevitably brought about by their own implicit or explicit philosophy, and that of others, or their desire to use favoured models or those of others around them? What is the need for faculty development to play a part in preparing them

for this dynamic situation? What is their story of shaping their relationship with the curriculum they are responsible for teaching? What tensions does this create, and how are these tensions experienced and negotiated by instructors?

Costa (1997) suggests that curriculum is a decision-making process, and that

> the ever present need for curriculum development is not easily understood by many who view curriculum as the transmission of information. If content is valued over process, the curriculum guides endure by merely adding and updating content from time to time. (¶ 1)

The curriculum process is described as three basic groups of decisions, based on one's philosophical orientation, including "(1) deciding on outcomes, goals, intentions and purposes; (2) deciding on strategies, materials, and organizational patterns to achieve those outcomes; and (3) deciding on how to assess whether those outcomes are achieved using strategies that were adopted" (¶ 1). This view holds some attraction for me in that the literature is expansive on the pressures felt by colleges generally and faculty particularly, and on the hopes and expectations that faculty development will step in to fill the need, but little is written on what faculty members actually do, or why they do it, in their personal process of curriculum development and in negotiating a relationship with the curriculum in readiness to fulfill their instructional role. Further, the underlying assumption that the curriculum process is shaped by the faculty members' philosophical orientation makes sense to me as a fundamental influence on the relationship ultimately created between faculty member and college curriculum.

Where I Am Coming From

In laying out the historical and current background of community colleges as context for this study, and choosing to include philosophies of education, curriculum models and theories, and faculty development in colleges as part of my review of literature, I have operated based on implicit assumptions about what might happen as an instructor engages in curriculum development. Let me make these assumptions or notions or possibilities explicit. I believe curriculum development happens at the intersection of these ideas; the

personal philosophy of the instructor, the implicit or explicit model adopted in that instructor's personal and professional environment, the resources available or not, used or not, that the college provides to support the instructor, all within the pressures and influences of the historical and current context. The instructor's experience in setting out to make meaningful, intentional choices about what, and how, and why to teach – this is the catalyst for a story of curriculum development that might strike a chord of resonance, a spark of insight, a note of empathy.

> *While the events described took place quite some time ago now, the stories of my first personal experiences with college teaching and curriculum can still provoke some vivid pictures for me, and I know my sense of relationship to what I teach is, in part, wrapped up in these and other personal stories. I also know that my expectations about the relationship instructors have with their curricula are shaped by the stories I have heard told by other instructors over time. It seems, therefore, a worthwhile endeavour to bring forth and hear these stories about their relationship to the curriculum, so that as listeners, we might reflect upon and learn about our own practice. In doing so, I believe we become better teachers.*

Significance and the Need for this Study

The significance of exploring the story of college instructors' experience with curriculum development is not to suggest one best way to develop curriculum, nor to generalize about the efficacy of certain strategies, but rather, through the telling of stories that resonate amongst a community of readers interested in college curriculum and teaching, to spark a reflective learning process within the reader; college instructors may contemplate their own ways of creating a relationship to the curriculum they teach, perhaps reaffirming their own process of curriculum development, sharing the frustrations of others, or gaining insight into new strategies they may explore. Readers in other roles in the educational context may reflect upon the interface of their roles with the

process of curriculum development and teaching, including their contribution to these processes, or what choices might exist to do things differently. In this way I hope the study will extend and deepen our understanding of experiences of curriculum development in colleges.

The relative absence of writing in the field of college curriculum development and preparation for teaching, the changing landscape within which curriculum development and teaching take place, and the need for writing to remain current with practice create the need for the study. It will contribute to and expand this field, with a qualitative study that explores the experiences of instructors from a Canadian college setting. As a narrative inquiry it invites reflection on current practices or experiences familiar to the reader, and learning will be achieved through this mirroring between the reader's experience and the themes expressed through the narrative work of the study participants.

CHAPTER III: CONDUCTING THE NARRATIVE INQUIRY

Choice of Narrative Inquiry

It has been my choice to use narrative inquiry to explore the questions in this study. From a personal perspective, this choice reflects my view that social reality is constructed and best expressed through the words and stories of individuals who have come together to share ideas, and that learning happens when individuals reflect on the meaningfulness to their own reality of something outside themselves. This potential for learning is introduced by Blades (1997) who writes

> When I teach I am always impressed with the ability of stories to capture the attention of my students. The words 'Let us begin with a story' are almost magical in the way the teaching relationship with students transforms from the didactic to communal . . . story telling is more than entertainment but an invitation to reflect together through the communion of story so that our shared wisdom might reveal possibilities otherwise covered by the business of living. (p. 7)

It seems to me that college teaching is ripe with possibilities for reflective learning among colleagues, yet we too seldom share our stories about our relationship with the curriculum, perhaps due to uncertainty about how the listener may react. Or perhaps because we are employed to be subject experts in our teaching discipline, we fear admitting our relationship with the curriculum is not all we would like it to be, or at least not yet. Perhaps implicit assumptions that we already have a deep and connected relationship with the subject ultimately deny us the opportunity to create a more meaningful relationship with the curriculum in a more public or outward fashion through the sharing of stories among colleagues. While stories about what happened in class today abound, they tend to focus on other people (namely the students) and their behaviour or words, and, if the story is self focused (perhaps about what actions were taken by the instructor or activities introduced by the instructor to the students), it usually reflects the outcome of an earlier activity, rather than the larger process of curriculum development within which the one activity and its outcome are nested. My interest has been to explore what happened prior to the class, or even following the last class, and

what might happen before the next class. These, to me, represent the stories of the ongoing relationship an instructor has with the curriculum, and while they have profound influence on what may happen in a class, they are a different story than a classroom story or teaching story. Saying that these curriculum relationship stories are too seldom told is not to say that they don't ever happen; indeed some of my richest learning experiences with other colleagues have come about on reflection of what happens in those deeply important spaces before a class or course, between classes, and after a course ends.

In discussing what narrative inquirers do, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe a metaphorical three dimensional study space, where the personal and social make up one dimension, past, present, and future make up a second, and place a third (p. 50). Working within this study space is described as moving inward and outward along the personal and social dimension, and backward and forward along the past, present, and future dimension:

> . . . *inward* and *outward*, *backward* and *forward*. By inward we mean toward the internal conditions, such as feelings, hopes aesthetic reactions, and moral dispositions. By outward we mean toward the existential conditions, that is, the environment. By backward and forward, we refer to temporality – past, present, and future. (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 50)

The third dimension attends to the specific concrete physical and topological boundaries of inquiry landscapes (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 51). Narrative inquirers use the space created within these three dimensions as a way to re-story and understand experience.

I have used this metaphoric space to share in and understand two colleagues' stories and to move within this space with a number of more experienced colleagues. This three dimensional space enabled me to reflect on my own experience, the shared stories of others, and the experience of sharing the stories, and to learn from this process. I have written of what I have learned so that others may reflect and learn also. This study space captured our story as we came into the inquiry and I met with each participant, as we moved apart, as time passed and events took place around us, as we reconnected and

ultimately moved out and beyond the space of this inquiry. We looked backward to our own personal stories, and forward to anticipate how our stories might unfold in future. As the educational landscape changed around the college over the time of the inquiry and the college shifted and adapted in response, we reflected on the outward changes in our individual professional homes, and our inner experiences of those changes as we engaged with the process of curriculum development. The shape of the three dimensional space changed as, over time in our conversations, our reflection deepened one dimension and then another, pushing out the boundaries of the study space. As I leave this study space, I find myself not surprised that the shape of the study was unforetold, and, while my curiosity about curriculum development and its personal meaningfulness to me is woven into the very fabric of my being, the connectedness of the emergent themes feels new and exciting. This is how the study was done...

The Participants and Our Process Together

At the outset of this study it was my intention to seek out a single participant from amongst instructors who teach credit courses at one Alberta college. I envisioned that the person would be a full-time instructor early in their employment with the college, and who indicated some commitment to a full-time teaching career. I pictured that this commitment would perhaps come out of an enthusiasm, hopefully a passion for college teaching which storied the person's everyday life, and would bring it all into a conversation of making meaning of curriculum. While I have noted that I don't think these types of conversation happen as often as they might, I have met other instructors over my teaching career that are keenly interested in how the curriculum evolves and is shaped into what is taught, and in why we make the curriculum choices we do. These issues and interests in what I would call curriculum development have been the seed of many interesting, incidental, and sadly, too fleeting conversations with colleagues in passing while engaged in various college activities. I wanted the opportunity to stay with the conversation, to discuss and reflect on our thinking over some time, and to deepen the texture of what we happened upon. My challenge in seeking out a participant to work

with me on this was that there existed a wealth of candidates rather than a dearth of potential participants. Given the timeline I worked on, and the richness I felt working with more than one participant could afford the study, I decided to choose two individuals, John and Hannah, both of whom reflected my intentions above, and who I invited separately to participate in the study.

I met John a year before our conversations for this inquiry began, and his enthusiasm for teaching and learning were evident from first introduction. We had participated in a faculty development activity together which had brought us into a number of discussions about what we taught, how we taught it, and why we made the choices we did. He was at an early stage of his teaching with the college, but had commitment and enthusiasm to continue and expand his work as a college instructor.

Hannah's name was provided to me in speaking with a colleague about my dissertation inquiry and topic. She, too, was at an early stage of teaching with the college, and while our paths had not crossed, we had been part of a larger community of people interested in various aspects of teaching and learning in the college. I contacted her directly, and we agreed to meet and discuss my work in this inquiry. She expressed interest and curiosity and, when first meeting, we found we had much in common despite our relatively different teaching and educational backgrounds, and different career stage.

Both Hannah and John expressed willingness to participate, but some early hesitation when considering curriculum development as the topic of study, as neither considered themselves expert in the subject. I met with each of them individually, and as I provided the proposal and outlined my hopes and expectations for the study, our separate conversations grew comfortable and animated. Their early hesitation faded as I noted that their experience as instructors was of primary interest relative to curriculum development, and expertise in curriculum development as a field of study was not pre-requisite to their participation. Each of them made the commitment to work with me over

the course of the next year, and I felt then (and have continued to feel) very thankful indeed!

In my proposal for this inquiry, I expressed that I expected to be an active participant in this study, to declare myself and my intentions to my primary participant colleagues, and to others involved in both the research process and as readers. I have attempted throughout the study to note my experience and growing awareness of the issues involved, and have written myself into the study in some measure as the autobiographical nature of narrative inquiry demands. I have found this need to clarify my voice the greatest challenge of the entire work, and yet, in many ways, I believe it to be why I was intuitively drawn to work with narrative. I am an experienced instructor; I do care about my work with curriculum, and have paid great attention over many years to the processes, practices, choices and tensions that shape what we do in the classroom and beyond. And yet, to make sense of my own experience, and to explore the possibilities that others experience can open for me, I have needed to be more transparent in what I believe and what has happened for me throughout this process.

In addition to my own participation, and that of my primary participants, Hannah and John, I invited three other, more experienced instructors to reflect upon the re-storied experiences of Hannah, John, and myself, and to share their thoughts, insights, ideas, and beliefs about curriculum development based on their own experience. While the intention was not that they be representative of particular groups, I had been hopeful that some diversity could be achieved within the group in terms of age, gender, length of experience with the college, subject area taught, and employment status with the college. I had felt that this diversity would spark a depth of reflection that would enrich Hannah and John's narrative, and create space and opportunity for me as researcher and colleague to create a piece of writing that would stimulate thoughtful reflection and learning in the broader college community and beyond.

I feel deeply appreciative that Alex, Sasha and Diane agreed to work with me as the more experienced group of individuals who I turned to for reflection and insight throughout this inquiry. I had known and worked with each of these individuals over many years with the college, although to varying degrees. Our career paths had crossed at the college in a number of ways, and I anticipated that each had a wealth of experience to share through their own stories, and in thoughtful reflection on the stories of others. However, I found asking them to participate more daunting than I could have initially imagined. The very qualities that made them attractive to me as potential participants; their experience with the college community, their reputations as excellent instructors, their perceptions and insights into the teaching and learning processes as I had observed in many contexts, and their ease of communication, made them very busy people with numerous obligations. Would they have time? Would they see the value in participating? Was I exploring something that they cared about? They were enthusiastic in their agreement to participate. Once they signed on, my next set of doubts surfaced – was I ready to speak with them? Would the writing I had done to that point engage their interest? Would the writing, my questions, and our conversations, stimulate the depth and nature of reflection I was counting on?

My fears were unfounded, as I was reminded each time I met with one of these more senior colleagues. Their differing backgrounds, disciplines, personalities, and philosophies provided a range of thought and perspective on the stories of our newer colleagues that enriched my understanding of the experience of curriculum development immeasurably. This is not to say the conversations were easy or straightforward – I was, on a number of occasions, surprised and caught off guard when emotions or assumptions or philosophical interpretations required me to deconstruct an idea or sense I had of an experience and shift the lens to begin to see a new view. I recall a time or two when I felt the bottom of my understanding had dropped out of my bucket, leaving a momentary big, black hole – a very upsetting feeling indeed! However, their reflections and insight offered new ways to understand the stories of others and my own experience, and challenged me to open new possibilities to consider how or why our experiences are

shared or differ. Their ability to express what resonated from the initial stories, and their energy to consider the implications of the tensions felt earlier in their own careers and expressed in the current lives of less experienced colleagues offered a great deal to this inquiry. I am grateful for their participation.

Assumptions

> . . . social sciences are founded on the study of experience. Experience is, therefore, the starting point and key term for all social science inquiry. (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998, p. 152)

In an attempt to navigate a middle ground between the formalistic (ie., the experience recedes behind the text, a social organization) and the reductionistic (i.e., experience too comprehensive to permit useful inquiry) (p. 153), Clandinin and Connelly (1998) come to the study of narrative and storytelling, and make the assumption that experience is both temporal (D. Carr, 1986; Ricoeur, 1984) and storied (D. Carr, 1986; Crities, 1971; Heilbrun, 1988; as cited in Clandinin & Connelly, 1998, p. 154). The movement from temporal, storied experience to research text presumes a relationship between researcher and participant. As noted by Clandinin and Connelly,

> Researcher relationships to ongoing participant stories shape the nature of field texts and establish the epistemological status of them. We assume that a relationship embeds meaning in the text and imposes form on the research texts ultimately developed. A field note is not simply a field note; a photograph is not simply a photograph; an oral history is not simply an oral history. What is told, as well as the meaning of what is told, is shaped by the relationship. The field text created may be more or less collaboratively constructed, may be more or less interpretive, may be more or less researcher influenced. It depends. (1998, p. 162)

In choosing to locate myself as researcher, and to identify myself as a co-participant by virtue of sharing the role of college instructor with my initial individual instructors as well as the later reflective group of instructors, I made explicit my relationship with the participants as we entered and continued to work within the inquiry field. I continued to share my progress with participants, and my unfolding story throughout this inquiry, until, only as the writing came to a close, I met with and bade farewell to my participants

as participants. My sense of this experience is that we have come into, worked within, and have moved beyond the study in a positive, thoughtful, caring, and gently humoured way of being together which continues to remain open to new learning individually and, as we meet from time to time, together.

Being in the Field and Creating Field Texts

The three dimensional narrative inquiry space described by Clandinin and Connelly creates an inquiry field that we enter into as we come to each new inquiry. They speak of beginning in the midst:

> As researchers, we come to each new inquiry field living our stories. Our participants also enter the inquiry field in the midst of living their stories. Their lives do not begin the day we arrive nor do they end as we leave. Their lives continue. Furthermore, the places in which they live and work, their classrooms, their schools and their communities, are also in the midst when we researchers arrive. Their institutions and their communities, their landscapes in the broadest sense, are also in the midst of stories. (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 65)

I came into the inquiry field of this narrative study in the midst of both my life story and its various dimensions, as well as in the midst of my participant instructors' ongoing stories. Prior to having come together in this inquiry field and commencing to negotiate our relationship, our purpose, and our way of working together, I had begun to create field texts.

> What are normally called data - journal entries, field notes, photographs, and so on - are, for us, better thought of as field texts. They are texts created by participants and researchers to represent aspects of field experience. (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998, p. 162)

Clandinin and Connelly (1988, 1998, 2000) identify a number of tools for reflection and methods to assist with moving from field experience to field text, including storytelling, letter writing, teacher interviews, participant observation, oral history, annals and chronicles, family stories, photographs, memory boxes, other personal/family artifacts, research interviews, journals, autobiographical writing, conversations, field notes and other stories from the field, documents, and life experience as a source of field texts. My

experience with curriculum development, and my positioning as a participant in this inquiry led me to begin the field text with autobiographical notes, stories and recollections prior to meeting with my participants. What began as a rather mechanical tallying of past incidents of note that I felt might figure into the story of the inquiry became a deeply introspective process where, over a period of several months, my current everyday experiences would frequently spark memories of events and feelings that I had not thought of in years. I felt a keenly heightened sensitivity to all things curricular (which I'm sure must have annoyed some of my close colleagues exceedingly!), and this keenness to explore the meaning of curriculum development stories carried over as I began to meet with my participants.

I anticipated that, beyond autobiographical writing, individual conversations with the participants would form the basis of my field text, and such has been the case. While I remained open to the possibility of other materials being introduced, our conversations, telephone and e-mail communication, and written texts of our thematic reflections formed the content out of which the research text was later developed. The conversations that were the foundation of the field text were informed by a number of documents and communiqués in our environment, and included various items which reflected current events, both internal to the college, and outside influences which shaped college life. Events, decisions, and news featured in the internal college newsletter and global e-mail were often a part of our discussions, as they frequently spoke of influences which shaped our thoughts, actions and emotions as college instructors through the time and space of this inquiry, and so became part of the curriculum development process for each of us. While I had anticipated that documents demonstrating curriculum development processes might feature as part of the text, this did not, in fact, take place. Our stories of curriculum development focused on the experience rather than the outcome of these processes, and as such we did not explore the formalized curriculum documents that I might have expected to be produced as a result of the curriculum development activity and experience.

My experience of being in the field of inquiry and developing field texts moved through a cyclical process of meetings and conversations, written transcription, and response to and reflection on the transcribed work. After contacting John and Hannah by telephone to discuss the possibility of their participating in the inquiry, and e-mailing with follow-up material, I met with each of them to discuss the inquiry and to confirm their participation. Subsequent to their agreement to participate, I met first with Hannah and then with John for longer conversations. We started with the focusing questions identified earlier in this study and the particular direction these conversations then took was determined by the participant instructors in terms of what was meaningful to each in their relationship with the curriculum they teach and their experience in preparing to teach it, by their own reflection on these stories, by the shared reflections of myself and of others, and by the events of their lives over the course of the inquiry timeline we shared. I had anticipated that the stories would take the form of relating particular activities and incidents that the participants felt described their curriculum development experience; for example, I thought I might hear more specific details of activities, processes, decisions, and models. Instead, the stories, which often began with a particular activity, quickly and persistently moved to a broader description of negotiating the influences and tensions that were, for the participants, an imbedded dimension of the curriculum development process itself.

I met with Hannah in her office, which afforded me the benefit of seeing the context of her work. John and I agreed to meet at my office in order to have privacy: his office space was shared with two other faculty members. Each conversation was one and a half to two hours long, and was audio taped. The tapes were transcribed and I returned the transcripts to each of them by e-mail. My cover letter included some ideas and reflections, and a possible timeline for our next conversation. Each new conversation began with reflection on the transcript and its surprises or curiosities, and with an unfolding of our thinking that had moved on between visits. During each visit we tended to start with one or two ideas that sparked further richness to the story, and then moved to a deeper reflection on the significance and meaning that began to emerge in their narrative. Between the first and the second conversation with John and Hannah, I began

to create connections and relationships between their immediate story and our greater concerns about college work life, and this prompted me to capture some of these ideas in three fictionalized mini-narratives of about ¾ of a page of writing. I shared these mini-narratives with each of them between our second and third visits, and suggested that our next conversation might reflect on this writing and its harmony with each of their stories. Also between my second and third conversations with John and Hannah, I started to meet with my three reflective participants, whom I had spoken to and in two cases met with prior to our initial taped conversation. I shared with them the mini-narratives to give them access to the stories of John and Hannah in a way that maintained anonymity yet echoed the themes that were emerging, and which would subsequently form the basis of the writing in Chapter 5 of this research. Over the course of the next 9 months, starting in the winter of 2003, I met with Hannah and John twice more and with my reflective participants again. In between, there was e-mail communication as I provided transcripts back to the participants as well as further reflective writing on the emergent themes from our conversations and stories. I would also periodically meet up with my participants in the course of our college life together, and these incidental meetings also provided meaningful conversation that informed the field text.

Moving from Field Text to Research Text

As I began to share in Hannah's and John's experiences through re-storying the stories, and through inviting reflection from them and from the more experienced colleagues who made up my reflective group, themes emerged which captured experiences consistent with the college instructors' lives. In particular, beyond simply beginning to hear common or shared stories and thematic avenues to consider, an emotional level of tension and texture was introduced and maintained within the field of inquiry as Hannah, John, Alex, Sacha, and Diane experienced and storied their own relationship with their curriculum. As I worked to create a research text from the reflective processes described above, I began to hear ideas for a text that addressed curriculum development issues by looking inward and outward, forward and back, and at a place meaningful to me and to

others who are college instructors, and to the college community beyond. Emotions newly felt and long remembered, tensions and stresses built and relieved, decisions considered, taken or declined, difficult situations successfully negotiated, uncomfortably reconciled, or continuously traveling with us – these characterized our experience of our work and our reflection over both the recent and long standing stories.

Chapter 4 will share some of Hannah and John's narrative, as well as the reflections of Alex, Diane and Sacha, with a format suggested by the thematic similarity of experiences or concerns that began to echo through our time and intersecting conversations with one another. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the curriculum development experience as shaped by faculty development, power, leadership, philosophy, and commitment, reflecting on these themes as part of the experience of curriculum development in light of a renewed viewing of the literature in these areas. In Chapter 6, I will further explore the themes as part of the experience of curriculum development as well as some implications for consideration. I conclude this chapter, and the inquiry as a whole with my personal reflections on the experience of curriculum development and college instruction as I leave this study space and continue on my career path as a college instructor.

Trustworthiness or Wakefulness

Validity issues surface in any research process, notwithstanding the differing methodologies used. My choice of narrative inquiry included a conscious decision to not write to represent or generalize, but to stimulate reflection and open possibilities for learning. In making this choice, the demand for validity became less meaningful to me, and was replaced by a need for trustworthiness in the study. To achieve this I adapted and introduced in the research text a number of the verification procedures described by Cresswell (1998, pp. 201-203, as cited in Glesne, 1999, p. 32) namely, prolonged engagement, triangulation, clarification of researcher bias, member checking, rich, thick description, and external auditing. Within the context of this narrative inquiry, and making use of language more suited to narrative, I have included these elements in the

research process as described in the following paragraphs. In doing so, I have sought to maintain the authenticity of the experiences shared, the sincerity of feelings aroused, and the meaningfulness of the thematic intersections as lived by my participants, by me, and, I hope, by those who may read and reflect on their own curriculum development experiences, thereby ensuring trustworthiness in the inquiry.

Prolonged engagement is evidenced by the fact that the study was carried out over a period of a year, where my formal conversations with participants were held over a period nine months, and where the occasional sharing of ideas between one or other participant and myself continued over 14 months, all within the context of a shared workplace. My choice of reflective participants who did not know each other's identity, nor the identity of the two primary participants, offered some *triangulation*, as they noted that they did not know to whom I referred in the thematic writing, but that the experiences reflected could have come from their own area (although they did not, in fact). I countered *researcher bias* by being open and present about my participation throughout the writing of this study as well as with each participant, and provided transcripts and shared thematic writing to incorporate elements of *member checking*. The nature of narrative inquiry, and the form of writing used lent itself to *thick description*. I met with my doctoral supervisor, Dr. Margaret Haughey of the Department of Educational Policy Studies regularly, in part to ensure an appropriate level of *external auditing*. These meetings also provided valuable opportunities for further reflection in much the same manner as the conversations with my group of reflective participants at the college.

I am mindful, however, of the dangers of simply finding language more consistent with narrative, and re-applying validity or even trustworthiness measures ill-suited to a narrative way of being. Clandinin and Connelly characterize narrative inquiry as a kind of inquiry that challenges accepted inquiry and representation assumptions (2000, p. 184), and suggest that

> It is a kind of inquiry that necessitates ongoing reflection, what we call wakefulness. Narrative inquiry, positioned as it is at the boundaries of reductionistic and formalistic modes of inquiry, is in a state of development, a state that asks us as inquirers to be wakeful, and thoughtful, about all of our inquiry decisions. (p. 184)

Among other things, the authors identify the need to be wakeful about what we are doing as narrative inquirers, so we can continue to learn what it means to do narrative inquiry (p. 184). In doing so, and in responding to critiques of narrative inquiry, a variety of criteria other than validity, reliability, and generalizability are considered; Clandinin and Connelly speak of good narrative as having an *explanatory, invitational quality*, as having *authenticity*, as having *adequacy* and *plausibility* (p. 185). Given the state of development of narrative inquiry, and the interest in developing criteria that work within the three dimensional study space, Clandinin and Connelly encourage researchers to say which criteria they would want used to judge their narrative inquiry (2000, p. 185).

In my aspiration to engage in, and be part of what might be considered good narrative, the criteria of narrative having an explanatory, invitational quality seemed particularly compelling to me. Perhaps this is because the narrative of college instructors and curriculum development seems largely unspoken; my desire is to invite others to join with me in a conversation about college curriculum. My efforts to write in such a way as to explain and invite are a response to this criterion. Given that this study has worked extensively with a small number of participants, and the ethical considerations that entails, the criteria of adequacy and plausibility, and of authenticity have been a significant and necessary challenge in moving the research text from my telling of two individuals' stories to the thematic level where readers will trust the narrative to be genuine and trustworthy.

In Consideration of Ethics

It is a primary consideration that all participants in this inquiry be safe from harm stemming from the research process. Ethical review processes were completed at the

institution of study and The University of Alberta as a condition of undertaking the study. I did describe the purpose and intentions of the inquiry in both oral and written form to the two instructors I worked with initially as well as to the three instructors invited to share in the experience of reflection. I asked each participant to sign written consent forms to indicate their willingness to participate in the inquiry, and I made them aware that they were free to withdraw at any time. Each participant signed a consent form, and indicated to me their understanding of the conditions of their participation and their freedom to withdraw at any time should they choose to do so.

Given the small number of participants involved, and the detailed disclosures of their personal professional stories, it was of paramount importance that I maintain anonymity in the field and research texts. Initially, one of the ways I had planned to do this was to bring together my story with that of my two primary participants, and create a meta-narrative that would capture the themes, textures, and tensions that would ring true across our varied experiences. The writing of fictionalized mini-narratives based on experiences shared by both primary participants, and the sharing of these with these participants and the three reflective participants, worked to create opportunities for reflection without revealing participants or their circumstances within the institution. One measure of the effectiveness of this process was provided as several occasions, participants commented on the likelihood of this story having happened in their division or faculty; thereby indicating that the stories were not so unique as to reveal the individual participants on whose story these were based. However, as I was invited into each of my primary participants personal stories' and the unique detail that gave rise to their concerns and curiosities about the curriculum development dimension of their role, it became apparent to me that to blend these into a meta-narrative would have a homogenizing effect, and would lose the tone that was struck by their individual experiences when shared. Perhaps more significantly, to do so would have lost a significant dimension of the work as it has unfolded; that while actual experiences in curriculum development vary considerably, the tension, concerns, influences and opportunities do gravitate to some larger themes. It became important to me then, to re-story the individual narratives while maintaining

anonymity through a number of safeguards; names were changed, as was gender in some but not all of the five (two primary, and three reflective) participants. Details in terms of discipline, circumstances, and decisions discussed in the narratives were at times altered or merged with the stories of others or myself in ways that protected anonymity but did not obscure the essential truthfulness of the narrative.

Timing of the Study

This inquiry began in March of 2003 with the completion of the ethics reviews, and my contact with the two initial participants. Our conversations began in May 2003, and including the meetings with the three reflective participants, concluded in January 2004.

CHAPTER IV: THE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE

From my earliest interest in curriculum development in the college setting, I have known there to be many ways in which individual instructors undertook the curriculum development dimension of their role. In my own experience, and that of colleagues I have spoken with over the years, the approach to creating and sustaining a meaningful relationship with the curriculum is something each of us has to grapple with throughout our careers. We seek to find some measure of confidence and comfort knowing that our curriculum development efforts have added value to the learning process and outcomes for our students. I desired to better understand my own experience with this dimension of my professional life, and to gain some insight into the experiences of two other instructors through this narrative inquiry. In doing so, I sought to make sense of the individual stories we shared in a way that opens new possibilities for me and for others to learn about the curriculum development experience. In particular, I focused on the intersection between our personal understandings of what and how and why we choose to teach as we do, and the organizational negotiation and agreement of this as part of the teaching role for the college. Within the narrative space I found myself most engaged in the intersection of the personal and social dimensions. I lingered in and explored the tensions and issues that arose at these intersections – issues of status and power, leadership, commitment, personal philosophy and organizational support.

I began with individual stories and, in the process of sharing stories, of reflecting, of writing, and of reflecting on the writing, I awaited the development of themes as my conversations with participants unfolded over a period of time. While the details of each story are unique to us, upon reflection, four consistent themes emerged over time with clear tones and a gravitational pull for each of us. The notion of power as a critical force to create and shape our curriculum, and its presence or absence in our efforts to improve what we teach characterized our stories from their beginning. The relationship of curriculum and commitment – our commitment to teaching, to the institution, and its commitment to us – clearly shaped our own experience, and had been observed by each

of us in the experience of others around us. Our awareness of our own teaching philosophy, and that of those around us, and the implications of philosophical tension was reflected in each of our stories. Each of us expressed a desire to continue to learn about and become more skilled at the curriculum development dimension of our role, and in doing so looked to leadership and faculty development as essential and valued supports to meet this goal.

The writing that follows is based on these themes, although for the most part, they were not articulated until all our conversations had been concluded, and I had spent considerable time reflecting on our work together. Our conversations started with a chronology including some biographical background and then turned to exploring their ideas sparked by the focusing questions I had provided, whether through direct answers to the questions, or simply discussing the significance of, or their experience with, the question topic. This evolved into sharing stories of curriculum development, but we soon stopped to explore particular points of interest to both of us. When we began to reflect back on previous conversations, I tentatively suggested some of the thematic motifs I felt I was hearing. This sparked further reflective stories connected to the initial experience the participant had shared. Rather than seeing an experience as connected to a thematic structure, both John and Hannah were inclined to stretch the size and shape of the three-dimensional study space. They looked farther backward in their experience for connected experiences, they took a deepened emotional look inward at the personal meaning of the experience, and they reflected on the significance of the story in the time and place within the college context. From my perspective, listening to the different stories of Hannah and John, I was captured by the resonant similarity of emotional tension despite differing circumstances. After meeting with John and with Hannah twice each, I created three mini-narratives that captured thematically connected elements of their stories, and shared these with my more senior reflective participants, Alex, Sacha, and Diane, as a way of entering into reflection on the re-storied narratives of Hannah and John. This, too, had the effect of prompting their own stories of parallel experience, but it also opened reflection on the significance and meaningfulness of these experiences with curriculum

development in the role of a college instructor. It was only after some period of months following the closure of these conversations, during which time I read and wrote and reflected on the narratives of each participant, that I came to the shape of the writing that follows, and the thematic connections it suggests for understanding college curriculum development.

Entering Into the Stories of Curriculum Development Experience

What comes out when someone first speaks about their curriculum development experience? This is how it began with Hannah...

We met for the first time in Hannah's office, where both the environment and the timing worked well to provide convenience and comfort to this first "official" conversation. Her space was enlivened with photographs and sayings that indicated her personal and professional interests – including an extensive body of literature in her subject area. An organized space, with many clues as to what was important and valued by this instructor.

We began with introductions of ourselves in terms of what our paths had been to this point of intersection; our life paths before coming into the college, how we came in and what had comprised our time at the college. A bright, vivacious, business-like woman in early middle age, Hannah had come to teaching on a part-time basis from her career field. She had gradually moved from part-time into full-time teaching, although she was not on a permanent appointment when we began to meet.

I had e-mailed my questions and curiosities about experience with curriculum development to her by way of introduction, and had indicated that these were intended as a starting place – that our conversations would no doubt take a path of their own as experience and story unfolded. I was simultaneously surprised, pleased, disarmed, and unprepared when Hannah drew a paper copy of these questions out of a folder, with

copious notes for each question! She had apparently invested considerable time in thinking about these ideas prior to my arrival.

So what came to the fore? What was important to her in considering my questions?

Experiences of Power and Curriculum

In my earliest recorded conversation with Hannah we spoke about coming into the organization, and what it was like to experience curriculum development in that environment. In my estimation, many of the outward dimensions of that experience could be predicted across almost any college setting: pressures to change, to develop or re-develop a program that will be a winner, to prepare students for their chosen future path, to compete with other institutions or other time choices the student might make. However, the inward experience of the newer instructor in making sense of these external realities was most compelling to me. What did it feel like? What were the dilemmas? The tensions? The doubts and questions? The expectations that these experiences raised?

Hannah introduced the concept of power in curriculum development very early in our first conversation. One of the most striking images that Hannah brought forward in early discussion was that of a funnel with all these influences and players at the wider upper end, and herself, the instructor, at the narrow, lower end – the spout. When I asked Hannah how she saw curriculum development in her area, she raised the image this way...

> *I see it as being kind of a big funnel, where at the top they have the most power to arrange, and then down at the bottom we are a little bit more tied and that, to me, is a bit backwards, but those are my experiences here with the formal curriculum.*

An uncomfortable image to me. What does this represent? It feels to me like a discussion of being squeezed and pressured by higher forces but still expected to produce, to work knowledgably with subject expertise yet be constrained by the upper forces of the funnel.

It was interesting to me that this pressure was different for her when working with curriculum development in non-credit activity.

> *Hannah: I've also done a few other things for outreach where I've been able to do my own curriculum planning, and development and work with the powers that be, the political interference that happens with any project you deal with...so I've been able to do a few things with those projects where I've been able to sort of have more control and ownership, and authorship over the things that they look at ...*

I wondered at the frustration this seemed to suggest with regard to credit offerings, and heard about fighting for more power in the formal curriculum process.

> *Hannah:...so it's interesting because I think at the grass roots level, or the level where we are interacting the students we tend to have a better sense of what needs to be done for our students or with our students so that they are better able to connect to the environment, we're more connected to that environment, but to have the funnel type approach, sometimes we need to fight a little bit and widen that narrow spout that we get at the end of it.*

While not immediately labeling it as such, Hannah's early identification of power as an issue made me wonder: how does power intrude in the process of curriculum development? It seems to be structural in Hannah's description of the funnel with the instructor at the bottom, and with players higher in the college and external forces further up at the top or wide end of the funnel. In this image, those at the wide end of the funnel clearly had with more power to make curriculum decisions and choices. I wondered at the frustration that came through as she spoke of this.

> *Me: So what would be an example? Could you describe an example of a situation where you felt that tension, or that frustration about saying "Okay, now the curriculum...the big funnel that becomes the curriculum approach says that I should be doing this, but what I really feel like doing is...?*

Hannah: ...sometimes some of the constraints such as the short period of time that they allot for that content in the classroom sometimes doesn't allow me to do that, so I. . . in order to make the real life connections I'm stuck then with time constraints ...while you have to cover these very important objectives, and there's not going to be enough time or that's not really fitting into the objective however, it's not what I personally or philosophically see as important...

Me: So...so what do you do, do you catch up elsewhere? Of can you add more time? Or how do you deal with that if it happens?

Hannah: Time, I think in terms of student time, I would never take more of their time...they've been allotted so many hours and students are very protective...they have to work and have other constraints, so I'm very cognizant of their time, and that's the time frame I have to work in. I think I have to be very creative, and I have to be an excellent critical thinker to be able to then work with the content, still get the same lessons involved, and somehow integrate the speaker in with the content in a creative manner so that they don't miss out on anything. Sometimes I can't do it, other times where there's a will there's a way to integrate that in, sometimes it will work ...it depends on the situation. I've probably had about a 50-50 flip if it's worked or not ....I try though! The days that it has worked I've had to work very hard and probably went home with migraine, so that was my cost!

This willingness to invest, to try and do what can be done at the classroom level to make a difference does seem to come at a personal cost. This suggests an ongoing struggle to do what is required within the given framework, while not letting go of what is personally important. I had to wonder how long a person might be willing to bash their head against that wall! I asked Hannah if she felt any power to move this change "up the funnel", to create a curriculum change at any level other than that available at such a personal cost.

I've tried to infiltrate the masses!! I've joined the curriculum committee! I decided that I would have both hands in the barrel trying to work with what we've got. I think in order to change I have to be involved in the process and understand all sides. So I've tried to do that, and it's taken a lot of time, but in that process I've joined a bunch of other sub-committees that have then looked even closer to devise a strategy of what we are really doing here, what matters. I think that with degree granting, things are going to change very quickly and very suddenly. I think that we are going to have to do a lot of curriculum development. So that was part of the stimulus to get involved...I want to be involved if things are going to change. Hum. I've put a lot of time and effort and thought into my work at the college, and I would want my voice heard!!

One of the curriculum activities I worked with and was given support for, one of the roles I had was cut, outright, no warning " by the way, it's gone"... and I had taken ownership of that curriculum and worked with it, and revised it, and it had become part of me, and I think to have that suddenly cut ...I was very upset, very upset, I did not see it coming, and I think the ones that are going to suffer are going to be the students. There's not that interest in that curriculum...there was no turning over point ...no handing it over. It was cut immediately.... I feel bad for the students, and I don't mean to wring sympathy but I do feel awful about it...like I said, the students are the ones who are going to suffer, they're not going to have the continuity any more... It was at a crucial point and I felt it was very bad timing but, I understand on the other hand that budgets mandate how things have to be arranged...What I'd like is a little more creativity on that part but unfortunately it's out of my control so ...Opportunities arise and we can all get more involved and hopefully we can change it.

Despite this note of optimism, the image of the funnel with its variations in power at different levels apparently raised some discomfort for Hannah as well, because later in

our conversation she went back to describing the role of others higher up at the wider end of the funnel:

> *I almost feel like the (administrator's) office is not connected to what we're really doing. So to make those decisions about that knowledge, that's scary! Very scary! And that's not to say that happens all the time, but it definitely is a concern...*

Hannah's frustration was palpable, despite her outward efforts to maintain some optimism. She expressed anxiety over whether decision makers really understood the situation, or had a firm grasp on the knowledge and skills needed by the industry. Her concern echoed feelings I have experienced, while perhaps under different circumstances. I can certainly recall times where I wanted to believe the right decisions were being made by the right people for the right reasons, but there would be a niggling sense of doubt, or concern that the power to make decisions about what was taught and how and why... that these decisions were perhaps not so well understood as they should be by those with the power to make the decisions.

This thematic thread of power and powerlessness also resonated with John's experience and was introduced by him in our first curriculum conversation. I met with John, another newer colleague, shortly after first meeting with Hannah. We met in my office, where interruptions could be kept to a minimum. We had been introduced previously through various college activities, but began our conversation in much the same manner as Hannah and I had; we spoke of entry to the college and our respective career paths to our present circumstances. John was a little older than Hannah, but like her had come into the college on a part-time teaching basis, moving into a full-time but not permanent faculty position. His personal warmth, informality of dress and approach, his energy, and his curiosity about education, learning, teaching, and college life gave him a freshness of manner that almost belied his age and experience. An energetic and resourceful person, John had come from an extensive and varied career background, which came up frequently in conversations as he related his teaching and curriculum to his "practical work in the field."

John was, even as we began, full of enthusiasm for an initiative he was taking to introduce change in the curriculum in his program.

> *I've come to the realization that I want to try and work on one aspect of these students... I'm looking at trying to work on those people skills. You and I've talked about that before. That's the issue that I'm going to try and address, and get it so that it's integrated into all of the courses that they take, Right? I want to try and make a difference – I want them to leave here and say "You know what? Because of these things, that's made a big difference in my confidence level as a professional..." I'd like to get it to the point where its integrated into all the courses.... that methodology, that way of presenting the material...*

I asked how this would happen, what process of curriculum development would help this. John replied:

> *One of the things I need to do is get some tools, tested, tried and true, on how to implement this in their curriculum, and to say "Here's some measuring sticks, this is how to use them, for these types of skills...".*

In this context it seemed that power came from John's efforts and ability to prove the thing could be done, that the curriculum development was something that all the other instructors involved could benefit from and could carry out in their own sections of the course. In effect, the power appeared to be more that of influence, the ability to convince other instructors that the change was for the better. And where did his ability to influence come from?

> *Me:* *Do you have a sense of confidence that you can make these changes happen? Or what's your process?*
>
> *John:* *You're going to laugh when I tell you about this! One of the things I'm waiting a little bit for is, hum, for Pat to come back. I think Pat'll jump right on board...*
>
> *Me:* *uh-huh...*

John: *I know Pat'll will absolutely jump right on board, and go 'Excellent'...*

Me: *Yup...*

John: *...so that's one thing – I'm not really waiting, I've got some other work I need to do before then...*

From there, he would offer it as a suggestion or improvement in courses across the curriculum.

Me: *So it sounds like your strategy... you are looking to enlist the support of someone else who will champion this along with you...*

John: *Right...*

Me: *And create the mechanisms for what may seem desirable but that people are questioning ' is it possible?' ... it sounds like you are saying people agree that it's a desirable thing, but if they don't know how to do it then ...*

John: *...then it's questionable....*

Me: *So your strategy sounds like you're going to enlist some support, pioneer some things, get some tools in place, and then...*

John: *Yeah!*

Me: *...and then you can basically sell the idea to others...*

John: *...Right!! so that's sorta where I'm at with that...and so that's like a curriculum development for ME, that's going to work on that one aspect of our students' skill set, and...and to be honest with you, I'm quite excited about doing that, because I think I can make a difference in that, you know?*

Me: *...and that's a whole program thing, really...*

John: *Yeah!*

Me: *...when you talk about threading it through different places.*

John: *Right!*

Me: *Do you teach all of the courses?*

John: *No*

Me: *...but you teach...?*

John: lots of different ones, uhmmm.

Like Hannah, John devoted considerable energy in his role as an instructor to try and change the curriculum. However, where Hannah spoke of the funnel, with its implications of power difference based on the width of the funnel and her personal location at the narrow spout end, John's observations made me think that he experienced the power as being held amongst colleagues at the same level with more seniority with teaching the same classes he was involved in. These were the people he needed to influence in order to change the curriculum, and he felt he needed to build an alliance with a senior colleague in order to persuade his peers.

The particular issues that this seems to speak to include consistency between different offerings of the same course: who has the power to both set the boundaries and decide what the boundaries should be consonant with, and who determines the norm or standards for instructors?

My colleagues in this inquiry didn't really speak directly of their experience with power; more simply, their expressions seemed to be about the very inward, personal desire to be able to make the choices they wanted to improve things and to offer to students the best curriculum experience they could. Both joys and frustrations seemed evident, yet each appeared to want to take action, trusting that this would yield the power to create change in a positive and meaningful way in the curriculum, or in the process of developing it.

While Hannah's experience of decision making power somewhere higher up sounds familiar to me, and the combined feelings of frustration and optimism are very evocative of times from my own background, it is John's narrative of trying to work within his own program that more clearly parallels my own story. The connection of a college program to the community it serves differs somewhat, and the location of power can run from strongly within the program to somewhere outside the program, depending on the program's relationship with its stakeholders. My experience, like John's, is that we have

a responsibility to be responsive to the larger community, and particularly to employers, but the actual standards and competencies are interpreted by the program. Combined with the considerable size of program, where each course might be taught by a number of people, the dynamic is one where the negotiation about curriculum takes place within the program, and the decision making power rests within the program, perhaps more than between the program and other levels or outside forces as experienced by Hannah.

Earlier in this report I described my first college teaching experiences, where I began teaching two different courses for different program areas at about the same time. My experience teaching the management course was to be my first course in a program that I have now taught in for almost 20 years. Some of the experiences strike me as being as much in evidence today as they were to me then, only now these things tend to happen to other people! In this reflection, I realize that I am now the senior person who appears to have the power to shape the curriculum, to create the course structure, choose materials, develop assignments, and suggest class activities to that newer person. Do they feel hampered by this pre-existing curriculum? I like to think the process allows both room to make the curriculum their own, as well as identifies clear parameters where there should be consistency amongst the many sections offered by the program. It did not always look thus – as noted earlier, I had occasion to re-locate to the urban area where the main college campus exists, and in doing so, to then become a full-time faculty member. However, I did not become full-time initially, and it was longer still before I was given a continuing appointment. In the meantime, however, I chose to become involved when opportunities to be part of the curriculum planning of individual courses were extended to me as a part-time instructor. I remember my participation in some of the curriculum development activities this way...

> *I always thought that attending meetings was part of the job, so even if I was just a part-time instructor, I felt a sense of obligation to attend what were called course coordination meetings. I remember being surprised that not everyone who taught was there – how would they find out what needed to be taught? What was*

agreed upon? What was required? What were they assuming? Clearly, I looked to these meetings as a means of determining what choices were mine to make versus what was to be a program choice. I suppose at some level I felt it was a good thing that there was some similarity between what I taught and what some of my colleagues taught. I guess because I had come into teaching in this program through a course which was pretty clearly defined, and for which there were a number of sections, I assumed that these meetings were the vehicle to determine what was that common ground between courses. And frankly, I just always felt the obligation to participate if I had been invited – felt that this was part of an instructor's job.

It probably wasn't until sometime later – maybe even a year or two – that I really began to sense the role of power in this process. Initially as a part-time instructor, I don't think I expected to be in control of the course content, but that being there to be part of the process was important, as was determining what level of consistency there should be between sections.

I remember my first course coordination meeting. I had been invited by a fellow instructor whom, I had come to understand, was the course coordinator. This person was an experienced instructor who had taught for about 10 years with the college. There were about five of us in total, and I was the only part-time person there. The process began with reviewing a document regarding the role of course coordination meetings – something which I now realize has probably cast some of my later views into something fairly firm, if not stone. The process was identified as one where various elements of the particular course were to be reviewed and decisions made – course objectives, text used, types of assignments and number and type of exams are memorable to me. The role of the course coordinator was to call the meeting, facilitate the process, and record the decisions and results for future planning purposes. I think there was also a requirement to report to the program chair, but the role did not convey power over the curriculum so much as

obligation to facilitate a collegial process. Nonetheless, power was in evidence. As I later came to understand it, experience with teaching, while not directly called seniority, played a major role in course curriculum decision making. I recall doing a lot more listening than speaking – something that would change over my years of participation at such events.

Although I don't recall feeling particularly dissatisfied with the courses I initially was hired to teach when I returned to the city, I do know that within a year of teaching along side some of my more experienced colleagues, I felt I had a greater contribution to make. While I felt there were areas of the course I wanted to do differently, I did believe in a level of consistency between sections. I didn't have a great need to make the course significantly different from what was agreed upon, nor did I want to do something significantly dissimilar to my colleagues. Instead, I wanted to take a greater role in shaping the course curriculum with my colleagues. I don't recall being frustrated at not being free to do whatever I wanted – somehow this didn't seem to be in the best interest of the students. My frustrations, such as they were, stemmed from a desire to work collaboratively to develop and improve the curriculum in a way that provided a fundamental level of consistency amongst sections, while also wanting to create a course with which I could feel a deep and meaningful relationship. It seemed that negotiation amongst us was the best way to do this. But now I wonder...was it my participation at earlier stages that provided this sense of relationship for me? Or was it the increase, over time, of my power, so that I both influenced my colleagues and the process itself, with the result that the curricular outcomes both appear collaborative and yet satisfy me? As I examine this concern, I reflect that my desire for consistency was not just based on a belief that "sameness" is somehow in the best interests of, or of value to, our students. While I think there is some degree of quality and fairness at issue, the process by which we arrive at consistency is of more interest to me. It is likely self-serving, but I want to know how other people address issues in the topic areas we teach, and I think we can and do improve our courses as we negotiate the areas for consistency and departure. I want these opportunities to learn from my colleagues. As we talk about our shared courses, I

am reminded of a comment credited to Peter Drucker: "the plan is nothing, planning is everything." I like to think I would be equally dissatisfied with a process whereby I alone held the power to tell others (or influence others) what to teach and how to teach it. I am at times very frustrated when colleagues don't make time, or don't seem to value the process of curriculum development, and I wonder what they do with the resulting decisions about course material and process...do they adopt them? Discard them? Can they make them their own, or do they even try?

So this is more about feeling empowered to play a meaningful role in collaboratively deciding how to teach a course than it is about having power to tell others, or to simply do what I want without reference to others. The experience I have described below perhaps captures the feelings of continued frustration with having the freedom to do what I want, yet not successfully negotiating the curriculum decision making with colleagues...

> *I worry that what I teach is not the same as, or that the curriculum in my course is not appropriately consistent with, what is taught by others teaching the same course ...how did it get this way?*
>
> *When I first taught this course I was given the outline and a textbook, and the person responsible for coordinating the many different sections of the course had given me an overview of the evaluation practices and tools currently used.*
>
> *The evaluation tools included a simulation that was part of a major assignment in the course. The simulation had been based on an American version of a workplace scenario, but re-written for a Canadian audience and packaged for our students. A lot of time and energy and investment had gone into this simulation, and the many students who had dealt with it had generally been quite engaged and had immersed themselves in the competitive spirit it engendered. Instructors who had used it over some time became, I think, quite proficient at the detail of what essentially appeared to be 'the game' and did not have a lot of preparation to do. So the simulation was a fixed part of the course....*

The first time I taught the course, I spent a lot of time understanding how the simulation worked, the nuances of the scenario it represented, and particularly the connection to our course objectives. The students seemed keenly interested, and I thought it was a workable type of activity...but there was definitely a competitive edge, and half the keenly interested students suddenly became less keen when the simulation came to its inevitable end. It included a win-lose scenario, and those that ended up on the losing end of the equation were markedly less interested in the course concepts than in their performance and its impact on their mark. Did use of the simulation teach them what was intended?

The second time through, the resulting attitude change in students was predictably there, and I became even less enamored of the simulation as part of the curriculum in my course. In addition to the significant change in atmosphere that resulted, I began to question the student's need for this particular experience. If our students were entering the Alberta workplace, the likelihood of encountering the situation paralleled by the situation might, at most, be a 30% chance...and even then, their level of responsibility to deal with the situation would be far lower than the roles they were required to carry out in the simulation. Over subsequent use of the simulation in perhaps 3 or 4 terms, I began to envision this activity as an alien beast that had invaded the otherwise positive relationship I had with the rest of the course, and I knew change was desperately needed if I were to remain teaching this course.

I began to work within the structure provided for changing course curriculum – in other words at a course coordinating meeting where all the instructors who taught the course came together to review what was happening in the course, and generally make suggestions and improvements. I cited my concerns about the applicability of the simulation assignment to the course objectives, and the impact I felt it had on student involvement and motivation. Within the group of us, a

number of my colleagues could appreciate the concerns I raised, and were willing to look at other ways to address the desired learning objectives in the curriculum. Resistance, however, from the remaining instructors was fierce! There was a very high level of commitment and investment in this simulation, and the desire to change the activity was minimal amongst this smaller group, which, notably, included the instructor with the coordination role. Consensus was not to be achieved at this meeting, nor at several subsequent meetings over the following term.

After repeated conversations at meetings and more informally, the decision was reached to maintain focus on the learning objective, but that this could be addressed through a number of means... change was going to happen! Out with the simulation in my sections!

In the number of terms following that meeting, my work with the curriculum has led to a very different assignment which I believe reflects the objectives of the course and helps the student develop skills needed when entering the likely workplace. I feel happy with the curriculum in the course and have worked hard to revise and enhance the assignment that has taken the place of the simulation. So on this score, my sense of the curriculum, and my relationship with it, is strong and positive, and I feel I am the instructor I was hired to be when I can have this relationship...but...

Now I realize that my teaching of this course, and indeed, the introduction of other possibilities by other instructors has led us to another uncomfortable intersection. I am quite aware that my course, and the students' experience of the curriculum, is significantly different than that of other instructors and other sections of the course. The instructor who played the coordinator role has since left the college, and the successor has taken a hands-off role with respect to fostering curriculum development in this course through meeting together as a community of interested instructors…

If some level of consistency in what the student might experience in different sections of a given course is a desirable goal, I fear we are off the mark...

Where is that place where I can feel positive about the curriculum both in terms of my individual experience of it with my students, but also with respect to a need for an experience not uncomfortably inconsistent with other students and instructors? Is there such a place?

The concern for consistency in the curriculum is one which instructors often agree is necessary for the sake of providing quality standards across different sections of the same course, but the degree of consistency can become a difficult point to negotiate. In my experience, consistency in course text, topics, type of assignments or exams and their weightings is accepted amongst instructors teaching a common course, leaving a measure of freedom to work creatively to achieve shared or consistent course objectives. This level of consistency has latterly been reinforced through the college's requirement that common course syllabi be filed that indicate course description, topics, assignment and exam weightings. I am also aware of instances across the college where a rigid adherence to a fixed curriculum is required, as well as instances of seemingly complete freedom and power to shape the curriculum. As I come upon them, the varied examples of consistency amongst common courses lead me to wonder what that experience is like for the instructor.

Each of us, Hannah, John, and I all seem to want the power to create curriculum that is personally meaningful and to which we feel deeply connected so that we might be better teachers and provide something more meaningful to our students. It seems that the issue of power is not so much the desire to have power over what others do as to have the ability to control our own choices and decisions about how and what we teach, and once available to us in this closest sphere, to be empowered to participate in a process beyond

our own class preparation that works with others to improve curriculum in a collegial manner and for the benefit of the program and students as a whole.

As part of this inquiry process, I spoke with a number of more experienced colleagues, and invited their reflection on early experiences with curriculum development captured by the mini-narratives I had written and shared earlier with Hannah and John. These were based on what had emerged from my first two meetings with Hannah and John, and provided a starting place for my more experienced participants to reflect on curriculum development. Their responses were varied in terms how closely their experiences resembled ours, but each offered insight on the relationship between power, position, and curriculum.

The first of these conversations was with Alex. What became apparent was that while John and Hannah and their experiences were quite different from one another in many ways, they did share the experience of working in a program where they were not the only person who might teach a particular course or subject. Alex suggested that this entry into a pre-existing group of program staff created a different experience than that of those who worked in very small programs, or who were brought on to teach a specialized subject that only they would teach.

> *Alex: ...in that period of time when I came in to the college, we were an island unto ourselves really. And we had an enormous amount of control, because we're not dealing with transfer, we're not dealing with multiple sections even. So the need to have consistency through sections or even consistent methodology, it didn't matter. So we could really do whatever we wanted and because I came right from being a practitioner, right out of the practice, I think for me, my relationship to this is a lot more personal than for many other people.... because of the things I've just said, we also have way more freedom. I only had to consult with myself because I was the chair of a program in which there was one full-time person...it was a kind of mix of exhilaration and terror actually because you'd go into the*

class and something would happen and you'd think "Okay, well that's not quite right, it shouldn't be like this, what am I doing anyway?" and you'd come into your office and you'd close the door and you'd go, "Okay, so now I'm going to meet with myself" and for the first few years I'd have to say it was quite disorienting because I was actually used to working in a much more collaborative team environment where people would help me.

It seems to me that the issue of power is still very much apparent, different though this experience might be. The awareness of the freedom to make the decisions speaks of both the joy and vulnerability of being in this position and feeling empowered, of being entrusted with making the right choices. To some degree, it also speaks of a certain loneliness in the experience, a lack or simple absence of the collegial support I envisioned when I wrote earlier of my desire to work collaboratively.

I next met with Diane, who spoke more directly of power and curriculum than any of my other colleagues. Diane has been a full-time college teacher for many years, and has worked extensively with the development of faculty members as they enter, and through their time with the college. In sharing and reflecting upon the experiences of curriculum development, Diane spoke of college teaching as...

. . . a scholarly activity, and should be held as such. I think in the face of pressure to train graduates for employment, which seems so prevalent these days, we need to demand scholarly pursuit from ourselves as faculty members... to protect this dimension of the work.

I asked if this was something that we had success in expecting of part-time faculty members. Where did this notion of scholarly study fit with other expectations of preparedness, particularly for those who come on a part-time basis to work with us? She began by reflecting on the experiences of the newer faculty members who desired greater freedom and power to develop their own curriculum, and then turned roles of newer and more senior instructors toward a different dynamic.

I think we have a position of privilege, and we are expected to use it for things like developing better course materials. You know, the part-time instructor comes to us, and sees that this is what we do full-time, and they expect us to do the curriculum development. They come to us as professionals, practitioners – and expect us to do the planning work, the academic work so that they can use their best skills in the teaching, the classroom experience. I know we have power here, and so do they, but it's accepted and even expected that we take the lead in our respective courses.

Diane described part-time instructors as choosing to teach at the college as part of a professional responsibility and obligation and/or for personal development, but as full-time practitioners in their own field, not aspiring to a career as a college instructor, nor expecting to shape the curriculum beyond the individual nuances they bring to the classroom.

The issues of involvement, participation, and effort to bring about meaningful change in the curriculum raise questions for me about investment and commitment between the newer faculty member and the institution. In my experience, this position of power, the privileged position Diane spoke of differs from one program to another, perhaps based on such pragmatic considerations as the term of employment. The issue of term or type of employment within the broad category of college instructor raises some important questions for me about its relationship to curriculum development and power.

The college in this study employs instructional faculty members in a variety of employment categories: full-time continuing (meaning full-time permanent), part-time continuing (half-time permanent), full-time sessional (full-time on a year by year contract), and term instructors (on term-specific contract) who may teach a near to full-time load through to those who may teach only a single course while being employed full-time elsewhere. Based on information provided by the faculty association (personal communication), as of January 2004, the college had approximately 900 faculty

members, including 240 fulltime continuing, 10 part-time continuing, 48 sessional and 590 term appointments. The variety of appointments in any given program is based on the program size and need for flexibility; the smaller programs might include only one or two continuing staff and a number of term instructors who teach only a single course in specialized areas; larger programs have both of these types of instructors, plus perhaps a sizable number filling a middle ground made up of sessional and term instructors who consider teaching to be their primary occupation. I suspect the power of the sessional and term instructors to make choices about what to teach and how is perhaps mitigated by the terms of their employment. Anything less than fulltime continuing might feel less empowered to shape the curriculum over time, or even to have any control over their immediate course curriculum development.

There is a category of employee that I worry about particularly in terms of their role in curriculum development – the instructors who do not have the continuing commitment from the college or even a full-time sessional contract, and yet would identify college teaching as their primary and preferred occupation. According to the faculty association, a "significant number" of the term instructors (number not provided) teach just below the threshold which would make them eligible for sessional appointments, and further, some do so for many years. Faculty members with sessional appointments have all the benefits of continuing appointments except that their time horizon is limited to a year-by-year contract. In contrast, faculty with term appointments may end up teaching as much or nearly as much as sessional or continuing faculty members, but with significantly fewer benefits, and no certainty of re-appointment from one term to the next. Do their experiences as non-permanent employees lead term faculty members to experience a disconnect between reciprocal commitment and investment? I wonder how their commitment to the college, and in turn the college's commitment to them shapes their experience with the process of curriculum development. This really came to the fore for me and for my two newer colleagues in the following conversations. Coincidentally and yet quite naturally, both John and Hannah spoke of how their position and terms of

employment affected the curriculum development dimension of their role as a college instructor.

Conversations about Commitment

When I met with John again, we reflected on our previous conversation and picked up threads of the process of curriculum development between his colleagues and himself to examine further. We continued to explore the tension between demand for consistency and desire for creativity, and I asked how these were reconciled in his experience.

> *John: Mmmm? ..., it depends on the group of individuals. Sometimes it ends up being a more senior person that says 'this is where we're going' to some verbal back and forth 'this is what should be and this is why it works' to 'I don't think that's important anymore so why are we beating a dead horse?' I guess the experience that I've had personally using other people's material, and doing the same thing that they're doing ...uhm, students don't get a sense that this is you. This is somebody else's stuff that you are doing, and there's a problem there...*

We carried this conversation further, going back to our discussion of power and change from previous meetings. I sensed that John sounded less enthusiastic than when we had last spoken, and was somewhat more frustrated with the process of trying to influence people within his own program. He returned to the tension he felt when teaching material that didn't feel like his own in order to meet the standards of consistency asked of the instructors, and then feeling criticized by colleagues for being seen to use others' material, to be borrowing from others' work rather than creating his own. We spoke of this for some time, linking this desire to be creative and yet consistent with another related issue, that of the need to be relevant by remaining connected and active in the industry/professional field. In wondering how to balance these various competing pressures, I asked how a full-time instructor could deal with these various challenges. I was dismayed by John's response

John: *Well...I'm not going to have much choice ...they've taken away my sessional appointment...moved me back to term ...really kind of withdrawn their commitment to me...*

Me: *that's so disappointing...So how does that change what you do? Or how you think or plan...?*

John: *Good question, I was going to tell you about that!*

Me: *Yeah, do...!*

John: *you know, a colleague who found out that this had happened to me asked 'how do you feel about that?' and I said 'you know what? I really like working here, I like the environment, I like the hours, I like the...you know, uhm... but I'm looking at this now as an opportunity to go out into the industry again, gain some more knowledge and then be able to bring that back because I think the program may go through another cycle of growth...*

I returned to our previous conversation and the area he had expressed both energy and confidence in – that of his work to include a more significant interpersonal skills component in the program's curriculum.

Me: *Last time you talked about the desire to put together a few tools and sort of champion ideas about soft skills...*

John: *Uh-hum....*

Me: *And that you felt that you had some leadership... and now you've mentioned that a couple of people have been delegated that task and you are not one of them...is that part of...?*

John: *Part of the change of appointment, yeah...*

Me: *How does that feel? It sounded like something you could really get behind, and yet, you're not in that position now...*

John: *I could. I'm not. Somebody else has taken that on...you know what, to be honest with you, the experience has really soured me towards the college. And I get the politics here now... huge. And I know there isn't anything I*

can do about it, and there's nothing against those individuals who have that role now. You know, courses that I used to teach are now going to be taught by other people so that they can complete their workload, when they don't have the knowledge to teach that, and now I'm going to be a resource to them? Huh? You know? And that...that bothers me a little bit, but I looked at the big picture and I go, you know what? The bottom line for me in this thing...and this may sound shallow, but as long as I can make enough money to feed the family, I really could care less...you know? That's really the bottom line for me. Uhm...I don't...I don't ...my self worth isn't based on the work that I do...

Me: *And you've just had the experience where you are not getting the return on what you're willing to invest...*

John: *No.. no, I'm not...I am willing to invest in a certain level, because there will be something coming back, and that's the amount of teaching..., that is the bottom line.....so the courses that are available for me to teach are like very elementary, intro stuff, and uhm, if I really pushed it I could fill my schedule ... I could care less what I teach...it doesn't matter to me! I get paid the same dollar hourly rate whether I teach this stuff or I teach that stuff...and so I really don't care. I just see it as a means to an end, to carry on a lifestyle, that's all I see it as. My wife on the other hand is a little different, she looks more at the prestige level of these things. And I could care less about that, because I see in the big picture, you know what, it doesn't really matter.*

It was evident to me that John didn't have nearly the same desire to be involved with the curriculum development process that he had had previously, and that this was an outcome of the shifting of commitment between the college and himself. When he spoke of the students and his interaction with them, the desire to teach and the joy of teaching was still evident, but there was a definite retreat, a pulling back in terms of his investment in the development of the curriculum. I felt sad at the loss.

Sacha, another of my more experienced colleagues, echoed this experience. In reflecting on my re-storied narrative of John's experience, Sacha told a story of her own.

> *About 10 years ago we started doing the programming in this area, and a natural extension was the diploma – there wasn't a diploma in this area. So a number of us in our area chose to be on a committee and actually worked hard, I mean we had a lot of meetings for a couple of years, wrote a proposal, planned a presentation on information – that was when Access money was becoming available and everybody was jumping on the bandwagon to try and get it. And we did a lot of work and it didn't make the budget cut for the Access fund, and we had made the first cut and the second cut and there was quite a feeling of disappointment in our area at the time. It was a time when there were continuing appointments being given – but a lot of us, myself included, were doing it as so called "part-time" people, putting a lot of time into that, and then it didn't go through, it was deflating...it was a time.... it was a project that excited us.*
>
> *So after a year or two, the Dean says "I think we should get this going again" and a number of us again worked hard. There were some new people and we went to other colleges to see what they had – and we researched how other programs worked on it. I didn't have a permanent appointment, I just did it as an extra, and I did go to other colleges to see and wrote up what they were doing. I put a lot of time into it and I have to say, I don't think it affected the new people in the program who were full-time and hadn't worked on it when eventually the credential went to another program in another part of the college. There was a bit of sadness I guess from those of us that worked hard to get it going and that it's not in our program.... So you know, there's certainly benefits from working together and I wouldn't say I wouldn't do it again, but it was a lot of work for a lot of years and when you realize how quickly it can move around in the college, it might not be me the next time. I might choose a different move.*

The echo of these stories rings true for me. The desire to commit, to create, to be part of something that is worth being part of, these seem characteristic to me of faculty members who care about the curriculum. It also seems characteristic, in my experience, of people who, even though they may not have continuing appointments with the college, choose to invest their time, energy, and commitment in college initiatives. How often does it lead, though, to these feelings of disappointment, even of betrayal? Has the college held out something to us and, as we stretch for it, pulled it away? and if this has been our experience, would we do it again? Common sense suggests that there is a limit to what we might care to invest. An awareness of this certainly came through when I spoke with Hannah again.

Our next meeting uncovered another perspective on curriculum and commitment. Hannah had been involved with meetings within her program about significant changes to be made in the curriculum. As these were sweeping changes and likely to happen quickly, the meetings she described were program wide.

> *We had an urgent curriculum meeting one day. Sounds like the political decision has been made....so we need to get the new curriculum up and running which means we have to start with the planning process. What's interesting is normally I want to be involved and right in there, have a voice and work with it, and this time I just sort of sat back. I think our last conversation made me think of the situation I'm in ....*

I confirmed that this allusion was to her relatively new status with the program and the college, and the non-permanent nature of her appointment. She added that she saw herself as early in her teaching career with many personal choices to make, and continued to describe her experience at the meeting.

> *...So during this whole meeting, it was quite funny, I was silent. And I'm not usually silent! I had this perplexed look on my face and everybody one is gung ho but I'm thinking do you really understand the ramifications of starting from scratch all over again? And even though yes, this is a good thing and I guess I*

think we should go in this direction, I don't think we have a choice. Wait a minute here, we need to just kind of sit back and be reflective for a minute before we start cheering and envisioning what it's going to look like – our own little box, our own little gift or present. Can you imagine? It's scary anyway.

Hannah's reflection on her experience and her level of investment into the process threaded though that conversation. Unlike John, the pulling back was not due to a pulling back on the part of the college. In fact in some ways it seemed quite the opposite: the college was looking for a big commitment, and Hannah spoke of needing to step back and consider if this change in the curriculum represented an opportunity to be part of something she truly wanted, or an overwhelming, subsuming task into which she could endlessly throw herself.

I would love to get involved in all of that but I'm not sure if it's a bad time ... there comes a time when you have to detach yourself, I think you can get so wound up in the curriculum that it becomes almost a person or personal or you become enmeshed in it, but I think you have to pull back. And maybe that's what I'm starting to do – just sort of step back and say wait a minute, I need to sort of get the broader view.

This sense of being more cautious than perhaps she had been previously was even more strongly stated a bit later in the same conversation as Hannah noted that others had found her behaviour a bit out of character.

Yeah, a lot of people said to me "Boy, you were awfully quiet, we were waiting to hear something and we didn't hear anything from you today". And I had about five or six comments to me saying "You're quiet, are you feeling okay?" " Well are you sure?" "Yeah, I'm sure." It's kind of interesting. I don't know if it was the right or wrong choice, I don't even know if it was a conscious choice, but it just sort of happened. It was....it was...I don't know if it was good or bad, it just was. Next meeting, I might be inclined to say more, but I can't see myself jumping full throttle, both feet into the whole process and say "okay, now let me

take charge of this". It's not going to happen. I think it's a point in my life and this is where I'm at in my professional development and personal growth is important to me too so I need to start regaining that balance. I think that I will be able to achieve it by backing away a little bit, not being a driving force in that curriculum, but maybe being the cautious, careful, reflective thinker behind it. Maybe that will be my contribution.

This experience of stepping forward, stepping back...of being an enthusiastic supporter, even leader of change at one time and uncertain and doubtful and disappointed at other times seems near to me even though my own position has been one of stable commitment between the college and me for some time. The nearness comes variously from the depth and clarity of feelings from some time ago, the experiences of newer colleagues I observe in my own area, and a recent experience I have had that brought back "being the new guy on the block" very forcefully!

My story of being new, or less experienced amongst my colleagues, includes many of these familiar elements - the struggle to balance issues of investment and energy, commitment and withdrawing, hope and disappointment. It sounds like this...

When I first started teaching for the college, I was a part-time instructor... which I combined with related full-time work. As I have described earlier, I gave up the full-time work to move back and finish my master's thesis and in so doing set upon a path where I, almost accidentally, became a full-time instructor. For a period of about 3 years I taught fulltime but did not have a continuing or permanent appointment.

In some ways this was an easy choice on a personal level. Just past my mid-twenties, I was single, independent, and, in my eyes anyway, employable in a variety of areas. I hadn't come back to town with the intention of becoming a full-time college instructor, but within 10 months a full teaching load was offered to me, and I was both interested and flattered enough to give it a whirl! I quickly

became immersed in the activities of the department, and found myself with opportunities to be part of curriculum development activities, both on an individual course basis, and with the program as a whole. Even as a term instructor, I was asked to be course coordinator for two of our foundation course areas.

Meanwhile, I continued to do a number of contract and consulting activities, as I had done on first returning to town. These activities brought me into contact with the business community, which I felt could only benefit my teaching in the field of management. But my motives were not completely altruistic. Even though I was teaching a full load of courses each term, my employment position was not considered full-time, and there was no permanency to it. My contract work kept me in touch with a variety of outside people and places which I knew I might need to turn to.

I clearly recall that time...making choices to involve myself and do things that came up, and invest time and energy. I understood at the time that the way to become a full-time instructor was to be willing, to invest, and to demonstrate competency and commitment. I almost never said no to any opportunity that came up. In addition to a full teaching load, course coordination activities, overall program development initiatives, and outside contract work, I also took on international activities, teaching a summer in Hong Kong, and coordinating and teaching the curriculum component of a college based program for students from Singapore. I was the department contact, then co-chair, then for 2 years chair of a student conference with over a thousand participants. I served on academic council, was asked by the college president to be on, then to chair the college's task force on college governance...and more...

I tell this story not to sing my own glories but to point out that this was done for the most part as an employee on, effectively, a casual employment contract. While

there was some paid time to do parts of this work, much of it was done in addition to the requirements of the term teaching contract.... and I was not unusual! Many of us did this sort of thing on our way to fulltime continuing appointments.

There was, in those days, a clear link between effort and performance, and performance and outcomes...I understood it, and so did many of my newer contemporaries. We overfunctioned. And we were rewarded with continuing appointments.

Somehow my experience of this, and that of many of my colleagues, was that the way to get a full-time teaching position was to start part-time and work your way in. If I did my part, so would the college. For me, and perhaps many others, this worked and the sense of reciprocity was justified. But is this still the case? Or has it changed?

Sacha, whose story of working on a curriculum development project was described earlier, shared the experience of moving from term employment to a continuing appointment, in her case after many years of commitment to the college. When I asked for her reflections on these stories, she described a conversation she had had with a colleague about going back to work in their professional field.

Sacha: Commitment - that's the issue here. And you know, I felt a little...in the 1990s that we were contributing lots to the program and it did bother me but there was a freeze on hiring and there weren't these opportunities or full-time commitments etc., but I felt lucky because I did have the credential to go back to my field...I felt if I really wanted to, I could go back ... I'm good at that – and I've volunteered in the past and had enough knowledge that I could forge a bit of a career if I wanted to with that. And so it crossed my mind at times about what else I might do, but there are other people in the program here, especially if they have a Masters, that don't have that credential, those possibilities, so they haven't got that

option and they're more academic... And maybe they don't see themselves as having a career alternative....

But they've also made choices too. It took me time to take the other credential... I bumped into a woman who worked with us part-time...She said, "I could see I wasn't going to get a program position there, so I took some other training and got a full-time job elsewhere....I was always paid well with the other employer..." and now she's on a full pension!

She said "I didn't think I wanted to be a part-time professional forever, piece-meal courses, never knowing what I'd end up teaching."

Me: *I think if people have made choices that limit the options and now they have to figure out what do...if you felt that you had a narrow range of options, do you think it would determine the things that you involve yourself in?*

Sacha: *Oh yeah, absolutely. Well I thought I had options but I still made the commitment because I wanted to be here, I didn't want to do the other.*

Me: *Yes, and you were willing to live with the ambiguity that requires years upon years because you felt enough of a reward....*

Sacha: *That's right. I liked the program and by and large I like the whole atmosphere at the college.*

Alex, one of my experienced colleagues, and I pondered on the willingness and desire to commit, even if the outcomes were unknown. The idea of safety and risk came up in our conversation. We had been talking of the choices made by my newer colleagues, and their experiences with commitment and investment from both themselves and the college.

Me: *I think it's a very personal thing where people do not have continuing appointments and are in a position to....well, maybe they're facing that crossroads about choices and that they might make a different choice if they were in a continuing position.*

Alex: *... that sense of "Should I make the time investment if I'm not getting paid back?"– and the payback is going to be if I'm going to be working here next year and on...*

Me: *I would say I've often felt unsure – wondering "Is this the right thing to do? What gives me the ability to make these decisions? Is this the right choice?" I think to me, it's tied up with the question of identity. If this is the chance to identify with the role of being a college teacher, it may feel unsafe if the fulltime opportunity is not going to unfold, whereas if you feel still like you're a practitioner in your outside field or discipline, if you really still identify with that, you think "Okay, I'll go and do that somewhere else if this doesn't work out..." But at the beginning of that identity issue – "I am a college teacher and I'm going to invest in that and I'm going to put my time into that" – if that gives the sense of not being safe... it came very strongly from those two people that they share that interest wanting this to be fair, and wanting to invest in this role, but needing to be cautious, to hold back a bit.*

Alex: *Yeah. I don't discount their experience, and I believe it to be true, but as you're talking Joan, I think there's a huge irony there and that is – well I'll try to put my finger on it – to me it's that if the identity is shifting from the practitioner in order to be the college instructor, the full-time academic if you will, one of the things, of course, that is going to help them obtain an ongoing position or commitment from the institution is to take that risk and invest themselves.*

Me: *Yes ...I think the college has had a history of that sort of over functioning people...*

Alex: *...Yes, over function...*

Me: *Because you could...that's the way you got the job. But I'm not sure if that's the current experience ...it might still be a requirement but there's no guarantee that's going to get you the job anyway.*

Alex: *Right...Yeah, I mean it's just common sense on one level – give it your all – jump in with both feet... Like duh, that's going to help your chances!*

Me: *Yeah, and the irony is that both the people do do that. It's not a question that they don't actually take the risk, it's that sense of doubt and concern and wondering and tension they experience while they invest! That came through...*

This sense of the risks and rewards of involvement, the degree to which people choose to direct their energies toward investing in the college and specifically in curriculum development, even when the landscape is somewhat unstable and even perhaps unknown, leads me to wonder about the rewards. What does the experience hold as a reward that draws instructors, despite the tensions and uncertainties, into deepening their relationship with the curriculum they teach? I asked Hannah about the rewards.

Hannah: ***I think it's an impact on three levels – knowing that you contributed and I think to me something that's logical and very simple and surely a product that represents what we have here at the college. One thing that I feel is kind of going by the wayside is our unique culture. It was here when I started, it was gone before I could really define what it was. And it's just kind of slipped out the back door with all this corporate push, push, push that has come in the front door and I....I think we need to get back to our own curriculum - and granted it's corporate in some nature, it's all about money and status and prestige of the college, but internally I would like to see a product that represents our college. Being part of doing that would be a reward.... The next level is the interaction between me and the students and that kind of thing. I'd like to take the perspective that they're happy with what we are doing – when I see the smiles on their faces, their comments saying "That was one of the best", "We just think it's great – you've listened to us", "You've listened to the community and really integrated something that we're happy about." And then on a higher level, and this is something for the profession not only***

> *here but in the world saying "Yeah, that's proactive", "That's reasonable", "That's creative... in terms of we're going to take it further into the future." Those would be the benefits for me. They're pretty humanistic, altruistic goals but I feel that's where you have to start anyway...*

Hannah spoke of a particular activity where an opportunity for curriculum leadership had opened to her.

> *...so I've been able to practice and spread my wings that way. It's been invaluable in terms of experience. There have been no rewards in terms of financial reimbursement, or recognition in terms of course release or work load. That is something that we've voiced and have said "Wait a minute here, this is really labor intensive"...and it's not even as if I do my job for money but there's a point where you feel taken advantage of so you have to speak to that...and we have, and hopefully that will change, cause I really like the leading...*

Being part of the program, choosing to commit to developing curriculum beyond your individual class time, looking for commitment in return from the college. . . these are choices, complexities, concerns that my colleagues and I have experienced and pondered. One of the common themes in making these choices – the decision to go forward and be part of the curriculum development process – was described by my newer colleagues in terms of fitting in with the program, or at least fitting with some number of other more experienced people who represent the program to the newer instructor. Stories of philosophy and fit seemed to come out of these relationships and experiences between faculty members in a program.

About Philosophy and Curriculum

The idea of philosophy and its relation to curriculum development came up very early in my first conversation with Hannah.

Hannah: ...there's a couple of instructors that feel that planning curriculum is all about objectives, technical-rational, Tyler type models, "Here we go behaviorism, this is what we need and this is what we are going to inflict upon the students." And I am a strong believer in the humanist approach, and what we are doing with our current curriculum approach is focusing more on interaction, and that's where our curriculum needs to go to help the students better manage in the workforce. ....I think it's only a few people that I am dealing with right now, that kind of have the militant approach ... "we're going to inflict the education upon the student, the curriculum is very much black and white", but I come from... and I've learned all about the gray, and how to deal with the gray and enjoy the gray and make the gray your friend! I think you talk to people who are into their job and experienced and they very much believe in the gray. You find those that are brand new will sometimes go into that militant camp and know "where is the black'. Lately a lot of things going on at the faculty level – new staff, not a great orientation, lack of faculty development and orientation to program, probably...

Me: Has it helped to join in with the curriculum development process? If there are these differing curriculum philosophies represented among the faculty and teaching within the department, are they represented on the curriculum committee...and has it resulted in a curriculum that you feel philosophically meets you a little better than had you not participated in that process?

Hannah: At some levels, yes, and at some levels, no...it's increased my frustration because I've been uncovering things that I didn't know existed which usually prompts my brain to start thinking and not stop. On the

other hand, working with it has satisfied some of that as well. In terms of product creation, it's a long process, and I haven't seen a lot of alteration or change that's gone on...we've talked about it, we're going to make a lot more changes this spring, and of course if, in turn, we turn to degree granting, that will be a massive shift where that committee will be front and centre to effect that change. So, yes and no, it's still cause for some discomfort. I have that committee and another committee that I felt would sort of capture my imagination, and help me work through some of this, it's a college wide committee. To start that process of, "Well, what are other people doing? And let's look at the big picture here"...so getting out of that focus. I think is has to do with my lower level of experience and age and I've been so focused on my own program area. And I thought "Okay, well wait a minute, if I'm so focused here, I'm going to be buried in these problems," that's a bit of why I've done a lot of committee work and college wide, and have been really interested in what other people have to say. I'm really interested to hear what other people are doing and thinking...

It goes up and down, I would say, but I think the disappointments are what motivate me to keep going... I think they are just as important as the successes to the curriculum. I've learnt, over the past couple of years, this diversity is fabulous, I think diversity really will enrich the curriculum in the end...philosophies and perspectives are definitely owned by the individual, but the collective, the eclectic mosaic...? Peoples' beliefs and values around curriculum and how it's developed ...I think it's absolutely imperative...frustrating but a good thing!

I asked what impact this appeared to have for Hannah, or how this was experienced.

Hannah: *I think the main thing is diversity is a good thing. I do. I mean it's going to happen, there will be times where it is a hindrance on the type of*

curriculum and there's going to be a lot of dialogue back and forth. I think we need that dialogue to make a solid product. So diversity will be a good thing, it might be a frustrating thing but it will be a good thing. Yeah the camps still exist and even in the brainstorming that we've done, you can tell those that are very much behaviorist – "We want more this, more this, it's all about the this" yet the humanists are going "Well, we want more that". So there might actually....starting from scratch, there might actually be a compromise between the two by them each having their piece of the curriculum. So that might either bring them together or it also may not. It may result in delay.

Me: *Do you find yourself – you can identify as part of one camp? Do people do that?*

Hannah: *Um, it's hard to say – not outright. You just kind of know who belongs where and what their train of thought is. I think so often there is that sense of a reading – you get a reading as to whether somebody is on side – you're on side or you're off side and what you think of it. There are those philosophies. I know who I can go to talk to about one thing and who to stay away from. And how to ask the probing questions to figure out where they stand on the issue.*

I don't know. We're on the horizon and who knows what is over top of the other – if it's a cliff, or it's a mountain I'm not sure, but it's going to be interesting. But I've grown to appreciate....I mean you need the diversity or else you're not going to be able to offer a product to a diverse student population right? So you need something that appeals to both camps. This might be what brings us together – glues us back together. I don't know.

I wondered if this notion of there being camps, or competing philosophies in the curriculum development flowed down to the classroom level.

Hannah: *I would say the same courses are taught by people of different philosophies. Students are exposed to the curriculum through the facilitation of the instructor so they do get....there's a certain lens that that instructor puts on – the focus of the content – and inadvertently or purposefully, I think the instructor also places that focus or that lens on the teaching style or teaching methods because teaching methods will follow philosophy that kind of thing – and it'll vary between instructors of different camps. I think that students aren't quite at the level where they understand their own lens or their own philosophical position of pillars and I think then they see other pillars and I think what they respond to is either they mesh or there's kind of a reaction of "Oh, I don't like that" because you'll find instructors that are laid back maybe from a more humanist perspective so it's just a "Check out the scene, there's no need to do A, B, and C, because I can do A, B, and C through different means." You'll find students who are very much "Well I want to know exactly how many questions there are on the exam" or they want the more behavior types of philosophies; they'll say "Just tell me what I need to know, and I'll know it. Show me the skills, that's all I need." They'll definitely not mesh with another instructor who's not like that. And that's almost what you see them reacting to. They think it's the curriculum they don't like, but really it's the philosophical differences...*

John also spoke of the divisions between instructors that affected the curriculum, and his experience of trying to negotiate between the perspectives in curriculum development. He started with a description of his own approach...

I don't want it to be like a university course where "Here's all the theory , we'll cram your head full of it, but you really don't have any applicable skills, you still don't have any workable skills", right?

I asked John if this put him in a different place than his colleagues from a curriculum standpoint, and if that was problematic. He responded with

> *I think in all fairness, it would split the staff that we have right now, it would split them. There are those that tend toward the experiential and there are definitely those that tend towards the theoretical – "Let's just present the information and let's assume they can make the leap or the connection between." They seem to think the students will say "Oh, okay, now that I've read about this skill, I will try and apply it myself."*
>
> *I think the curriculum development process is an ongoing, growing, living, you know... you know, what worked and what didn't, and I certainly go to other instructors that I feel comfortable with and say, "You know what? I tried this today and it really, really worked well", or I may go and ask them, "When you're doing this, how do you do it? How does it work for you?" ...part of the problem in that interaction with other instructors is I'm not always confident that they're telling me honestly what they think. I think they're fearful that I might be judging them. You know I don't want to come across as challenging them, I just want to find out what works and what doesn't, and on the other hand I don't want to come to them and give them the impression that I'm not confident in what I'm doing... right? Does that make sense? And that's a difficult thing to do sometimes, and uhm... I'm not comfortable with all of the instructors that I have to work with to that level where I go and talk to them I know its just "You and me, and it's not leaving the room." That there's honesty and they're telling me... but I'm also confident in that who I am and where I'm at today is a good thing....there's mistakes, and at the end of it I go "Oops, that wasn't good", but I'm not sure all the instructors are at that point.*

John returned to the idea that the program was divided in terms of instructors who felt that the curriculum should be more experiential, and those who felt that it should be more

theoretical. He spoke of a particular colleague, someone he had indicated he did not feel comfortable going to and discussing his ideas openly.

> *And I don't know whether it would be fair to say that he's like "this" but I think there's a lot of instructors that go "The more information I can give them, the better ...if in the process I happen to cloud their view of the big picture, oh well", you know? And I think...uh...this colleague may be one of those people...I think he's really afraid that at the end of the day when the students leave here, he doesn't want a student to be able to say to an employer "They didn't show us that – they didn't tell us that...I didn't get enough information..." so in fear of doing that, I think we sometimes overload them, you know?*

Two of my more senior colleagues each offered their reflections on the philosophy and fit experiences shared by my newer colleagues, and spoke either directly or indirectly about their experience within their own areas. Alex reflected on Hannah's and John's stories:

> *Alex: ...the question that that raised for me, that first section, it is a huge problem. This example of where people work in the program are too different... if you don't have a similar philosophy of education, you don't have the same values, it's difficult to run the program, I think on some level. Now, I suppose you could argue that both ways, you could say that differences in approach are helpful to students, but there's got to be, I think, some confidence in understanding –"So are we in the business of training or in education?" would be one way to look at it. Some common parameters, otherwise you're going to have a heck of a hard time managing...*
>
> *I think we got lucky in terms of my program. There are just the two of us who are full-time faculty, and we see some of it with the part-timers. They teach only one course and so....we have so much more power than they do, to be blunt about it. They fit into that framework that evolves from our values or we don't hire them back. That's a crass way to say it, but it's*

> *the truth... I think this is a very important factor in curriculum development, and the real challenge is, how do you search that out? Or do you? Like, who is compatible and who isn't? And I started kind of chuckling and thinking – because, of course, over the years I've been on a whole bunch of interview panels – I have to say at this very cynical point of my career, you can ask all the questions you want, but until you see the person in operation in the classroom and functioning within the program, you really don't know. And I think that's a real challenge and we need to somehow address that...*

At the same time, Alex questioned the two camps, the black or white view that she sensed from my newer colleagues reflections, or the perceived tendency to identify with one faction or another. She spoke to the individual curriculum choices an instructor might make to embrace various needs arising out of differing philosophies.

> *... I still don't think the choice is that clear cut. Even if you've got content that is huge and you've got to fit it in and it's of a very technical, practical nature, there are always ways to get people to think about the bigger question, even if you go in and it takes five seconds to say "Here is a quick article I saw in the newspaper. Think about this" and send it to the students on e-mail. Put up a website that asks some of those broader questions. Take five minutes at the end of the class. And ask some of those bigger questions. So I guess I fundamentally don't accept that you can't do that. I appreciate the difficulty and the reality of making it happen and yeah, you can't do both extensively, but...*

Alex's experience and seniority in the hiring role seemed to allow the resolution of the competing philosophies issues both as an individual instructor and as a program leader. Sacha recognized the issue but had experienced a different impact in her program area. She wondered out loud if the philosophies of teaching and learning were linked to whether people had a background in teaching, apart from experience in the academic

discipline itself. Reflecting on those who, like herself, have a background in education, she commented

> *... we're not so caught up in the academics that we think we're lowering ourselves by teaching diploma students bread and butter skills. Some of my more academic colleagues say, " They should know this, they should do this"... Sure they should, but they don't, so lets just get on with it. But you know, if you're a real scholar, you might find that very difficult...*

In conversation at a different time, I asked Sacha how she experienced the college movement toward increased numbers of university level courses. In her program area, it seemed to separate the more academic, scholarly faculty members from those who had a more practical approach to the curriculum, with a resulting split in the teaching assignments.

> *Sacha: I'd say there are definitely some status issues involved – length of service or experience teaching here is less an indicator these days... those with a more academic philosophy are in the forefront now...the hiring has all been in that area, but you know, we all still have a role to fulfill in either the training or academic side, so maybe this separation is okay for now...it'll be interesting to see how it plays out in the long run. I'm not sure I want to end up being a second-class instructor in my own program!*

While both Alex and Sacha shared John's and Hannah's awareness of philosophical divergence, the impact of this on their sense of fit didn't even enter into our conversation. This made me wonder about my own sense of philosophy and fit and its bearing on my relationship with the curriculum I teach, notwithstanding the seniority and comfort achieved over time!

I have always felt lucky to be teaching in this program and at this particular time. I guess I would describe that as feeling a fit between my own philosophy of education, and of teaching and curriculum, and that which the program espouses. I would say there are

some particular program characteristics that have helped with this fit. The program I teach in is quite large and the faculty members diverse in their background, so the ability to find a fit is thereby enhanced. Finding that there are others with a similar philosophy is perhaps simply more likely due to our size and diversity, as is the likelihood that at some level differences are acceptable. Another program characteristic that perhaps reinforces the inclusiveness is the generalist nature of our program; where similar programs at other institutions focus on majors, or areas of specialization, we have maintained a focus on a generalist curriculum. The resulting graduates end up working in a very diverse range of post-college settings, or pursuing a variety of on-going educational opportunities. A singularity of outlook would not lend itself to this diversity of program inputs or outcomes. One curriculum development experience comes to mind where I re-experienced some of the early discomforts.

> *This past year or two, we have been working at clarifying course level outcomes for each course in our program. While the need to do this came to us as a requirement from higher level administration, we have, at times, made good use of this stimulus to explore individual courses: what the course should be about, where it fits in the program, what is important to be included in the course, what we expect of the student. At times, these meetings have led to some of the richest, most rewarding conversations I've had with colleagues investing in curriculum development.*
>
> *One particular day stands out in this experience. We had gathered to work on one of our senior level courses. Five of us were in the room including the course coordinator and four other people who teach the course periodically. We had been meeting over the last year and had revised the course to a place where we felt we had eliminated some persistent problems and weaknesses in the way the course was structured and which resources were used. This particular day we needed to clarify the outcomes and shape them into the accepted format.*

We chose a meeting room with big white boards to draft our thoughts, and had been working for more than an hour. The initial slow start had faded, and ideas were being readily offered and noted. We reaffirmed that the changes we had made over the previous year were, indeed, the improvements we had been looking for. The white board had a variety of thoughts captured in different people's scrawls, and the smell of markers was strong!

As we considered this new format of stating outcomes in the context of this course, we each began to clarify our own perspectives out loud, but suddenly hit a wall. One after another of us described what we thought the people taking the class would likely do after leaving the program, and the needs and motivations that had brought them to the program, and what we felt could be done while they were here with us. I grew to realize that the voices were strongly stating three quite separate views on what this course, and in fact the whole program was about: training for the workplace, a step in continuing higher education, or longer term education to be a joyful and contributing member of society. Each had been strongly, forcefully espoused, and the room became strangely silent. As if on one indrawn breath, we were all suddenly needing to sort out our thoughts relative to our colleagues – what was the purpose of this course? This program? Staring at the whiteboard allowed me to appear deep in thought about its contents while not making eye contact with anyone in the room, and my colleagues seemed to be making use of a similar strategy! I remember being amazed at the ticking of the clock, which I'd never before been aware of. I also remember a horrible moment of thinking that I had missed the point of the program over some number of years, and that I was completely, and shockingly, out of step with at least some of my colleagues. The moment stretched on interminably....

After what felt like hours of deadening silence, one of our group suggested in a somewhat tentative voice "well, or how about...D) All of the above?" We broke into laughter as a group – it seemed like a disaster had been averted, and we went

on to speak of what we were experiencing. In fact, "all of the above" did describe the range of how we collectively thought of college education and our program and this particular course. We all wanted to think that these purposes overlapped and could be achieved with a singular set of outcomes stated, but knew in our heart, and acknowledged out loud, that we made choices all the time. These philosophical goals did not always live comfortably with one another. What followed was one of the most interesting, revealing, thoughtful, and unguarded conversations I've ever had with a group of college instructor colleagues. We spoke of our beliefs about education, the college, our program and how we had all negotiated, or continued to negotiate, our educational philosophy in conjunction with our daily curriculum in order to feel like we fit. I know I felt among those whose personal philosophy seemed farthest from that which the college traditionally held – training for a workplace – and we described continuing to try to meet college training aspirations while enriching the curriculum to also fit with our more liberal or humanist views of education.

We didn't get our course outcomes stated that day – that would get done later. What we did do was speak openly of the joys and frustrations of feeling that we could respect the goals of the institutions, and the expressed needs of the incoming students, while at the same time honouring our own philosophy of education to reach beyond immediate employability as a purpose for being. While we don't all stand in the same place, and there will be times that the negotiation might be painful, we can communicate, and find a common ground through collaboration. I guess I do fit after all!

What makes this memorable to me, I think, is the depth of shock or fear I felt, however fleetingly, when I had the moment of feeling totally out of touch with what I though my colleagues might be doing: that even after nearly 20 years I could feel not only that I was out of touch, but that I was on a different planet, in a different universe from some of my

nearest colleagues. The moment passed, probably more quickly than I felt it did, but I was shocked at how completely disconnected I felt.

I also remember a totally irrational moment of anger at the person who had been program chair when I began my teaching with the college – this was a person that I had and continue to have a great deal of respect for, and I felt suddenly betrayed, as if I had not been told some important secret at the time I started teaching! It makes me now wonder what I expected the role of leadership to be in helping me understand my role in the curriculum development process.

Conversations About Leadership and Expectation

Each of my conversations with my colleagues for this study has given rise to ideas and expectations about leadership and its role in curriculum development.

My discussion with Hannah about how curriculum development actually worked in her area of the college quickly gave rise to the issue of leadership, and her expectations about how the current leader might support the role of curriculum development. There was a strong interconnection to previous themes of power and philosophy in how Hannah spoke of her expectations of the leader.

Hannah: *When you have a chair that doesn't maybe stand... or verbally come outright and say that they stand for, what we are doing in our curriculum, I find that the other camp can very easily infiltrate, and I've found it difficult to fight against that for what I believe in, so I think you need a strong leader to then direct the implementation of the curriculum.*

And does that really matter? I think having balance is key here – not only to myself and my own life, but I think this whole curriculum thing, I think there has to be balance and I feel it's up to the leadership to be overlooking and assuring that balance is there and saying, "Okay, we

have a big group, lets break up and I've made up the teams and I want you guys to go and meet and talk about more focused issues about curriculum." We are a big area: to have one brainstorming session is not going to do it.

This seemed to speak to the role of leader as arbiter in dealing with conflicting philosophies or power bases in curriculum, as well facilitator of process. Hannah reflected on her experience of being invited to participate in a wider level of program curriculum development, and compared it to opportunities in her own leadership role within individual courses

...it kind of speaks back to the leadership. I would hope that someone would be asking and getting us excited and wanting faculty to become involved in what's going on. I'm definitely an open person, and I'll make my opinion known if I need to .... So part of what goes on in course leading is we have the content, we have the course outline, we have a framework within which we can work, and then we have to take that creativity and what's going to work best in the framework, and I have, I think, a really important role of implementing that curriculum development and also altering it within the framework as we go along.

Hannah spoke of expectation of the leadership of her program area as well as her own expectations of herself as a leader. In contrast, John did not use the word leadership, but did clearly expect those in formalized leadership roles to facilitate the opportunities for instructors to work with curriculum development, and he believed that academic leadership should drive other managerial decisions. I had asked him how he intended to make a particular change in the curriculum that we had been discussing.

John: .... well, that's one of the other things, I have to meet with (program chair) because I know it's going to work. I need to get him to give me a couple of other courses. For instance, we have the (name of course), I think that's what they call it, and Della is teaching it, and I think we farm it out to another person who also teaches it, and I think between that course and

> *the one I currently do, I can really get the students to buy into how relevant this skill is, and get them to a level where they're comfortable experimenting, and trying on different things. Its not like I want to make them all the same as me. That's not my... that's not real – they still need to be real, you know? And so I think it's a process of trying something, and saying "You know what? That doesn't work for my personality. I need to do this a little different." ...and so I guess the difficult thing is going to be making sure that they continue to experiment, and use a process of growth...so I need to work with them through several courses to do that...*

Expectations of leadership were expressed by Hannah and John as they clearly anticipated leaders making decisions that would enable them to carry out the curriculum development activities they planned or hoped for. My conversations with more experienced participants gave a different tone to the discussion as they spoke of the activities they were engaged in where they themselves provided leadership to others. Diane spoke at length about her investment in development of a reading package for students that would be used by other instructors, Alex told a story of hiring part-time instructors, Sasha related how she first realized she was looked to by others as a mentor figure; each of these stories indicated their comfort level with making choices and supporting the work of others through leadership in formal and informal ways. There was no suggestion that they felt hampered or unsupported by leadership at higher levels, in fact, they did not refer to leadership except in terms of the broader college and its mission and direction.

I recall an experience when I realized that I did not look to higher levels of college leadership for answers about curriculum.

> *I was sitting in a meeting that included about 20 people: instructors, administrators at a number of levels and support staff. The discussion came around to talking about the registration procedures and support facilities that would be needed to make the new initiative fly, and one of the deans spoke with*

much consternation about what would and wouldn't be possible. A program chair stated in quite bald terms that if a certain procedure couldn't be put into place, the program was not going to go, period. Having made that comment, the program chair sat back and looked around the room. I remember, at that moment, looking at the administrators and thinking, "These people are just here to support us. We really are the leadership here."

Some time later, while I was the faculty member on the college board of governors, I was invited to speak at the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) annual conference. The session was a panel presentation on the roles of different board members, and my segment focused on the faculty member role. One of the key points I spoke to was the sense among faculty that, unlike the role of paid staff, into which we are often cast by the board, we really do see ourselves as the brain trust, the academic leadership of the institution, and that the administrators are entrusted with supporting us to do the work that best benefits the students. The presentation met with some success, with requests for copies from colleges across Canada.

I don't think I could have made these claims or presented that view without having grown into the role of a mature faculty member. I am reminded of work by Hersey and Blanchard (1988) on leadership that refers to mature followers – those individuals who have the experience, knowledge and skill to be self directing, and who need little from their leadership. As I reflect on this, I realize I was likely seven or eight years into my full-time teaching career before I began to feel this way, and my expectations of leadership have since been focused on gaining the support we need as instructors to do what we do best; to providing meaningful educational experiences to students based on continuously developing curriculum in our field of study.

Professional Development and Curriculum Understanding

In our conversations about curriculum development one topic was raised independently but consistently by my colleagues, both newer and more experienced. Just as it has done for me, faculty development had played a considerable role in my colleagues' view of curriculum and in their sense of how to effectively engage in curriculum development.

Hannah raised the connection early in our conversations when first speaking of differing philosophies:

> *Hannah:* *I think you talk to people who are into their job and experienced and they very much believe in "the gray." You find those that are brand new, though, will sometimes go into that militant camp and know "This is where the black and white is." This hasn't been helped by a lot of things going on at the faculty level lately – new staff, not a great orientation, lack of faculty development and orientation to program, probably...*

Clearly orientation and faculty development at the program level were seen by Hannah as a way that differing philosophies could be reconciled. Given her concern that, at the program level, these events were not satisfactory, Hannah expressed a need to go beyond the program to a college wide level to attempt to understand how her educational philosophy could live comfortably with the curricular differences felt between colleagues within the program.

> *Hannah:* *Another level of participation that I felt would sort of capture my imagination, and help me work through some of this is college wide faculty development. To start that process of "Well, what are other people doing? And let's look at the big picture here"...so getting out of that narrow "me versus them" focus. I think is has to do with my decreased level of experience and age and I've been so focused on the discipline I come from. I thought "Okay, well wait a minute, if I'm so focused here, I'm going to be buried in these problems" so that's a bit of why I've done*

a lot of committee work and college wide activity. I'm really interested in what other people have to say, for example, in the mentoring program. I'm really interested to hear what other people are doing and thinking...

Me: ...why would you say that might decrease the frustration to some degree?

Hannah: To do that? I think to satisfy the curiosity...for me, one of the things that starts me learning, I feel, is that discomfort knowing that there's something you don't know and an interest in finding out what that is ...it eases the questions and the frustrations and it gives me a practical way to be part of it ...to help have my voice be heard and not have it be stifled in my own program.

Seemingly the connection to a broader view provided by faculty development activity helped Hannah develop and maintain perspective on philosophical differences in curriculum approach at a personal level within her program. In a later conversation Hannah again credited faculty development, this time in playing a needed role in a major curriculum development process at the program level.

Hannah: One thing that's been coming forward in the push to develop a new curriculum, – one that's going to be marketable and flexible and just what the student wants, and yet meet all the required outcomes and be accredited and all that – they first started with faculty development, a hand in hand between curriculum development and faculty development should really be envisioned. By that I mean we can't structure any curriculum and not have faculty development. And the development of faculty needing to be on the same page as the curriculum, because developing a curriculum is great, but in order to get that curriculum to do what we need it to do... and ultimately faculty development is one thing that just keeps popping up in my life and popping up in my work place. It's quite funny actually!

We don't have program specific faculty development. We don't have a committee or a person who's responsible for orientation and program specific areas of development – getting people ready, showing them where the resources are. There is a college wide Faculty Development Committee which offers orientation for new staff – of course. So we are oriented to the general college wide community, but the program has no specific activities that we engage in, to not only orient the staff but also keep staff and faculty that's been around – keep them up to date on what's going on in the career area, what's going on in the program... Things are changing and what are our needs? so to get out there and ask us what our needs are in terms of implementing that curriculum. We've grown a huge amount since I started and yet there are no offices for some of these people, people are getting thrown into courses with no mentoring. When I started I had to go through that (mentoring). Now there's not even a paid mentoring area. It's "you're teaching this course, there you go" and some people are getting thrown into senior level courses and I think to actually teach senior level you really must understand what's gone on in prior terms. There's nothing in place and I've seen newer faculty be very frustrated. And not by their own fault and not to be negative, but they're really confused and I hear it in the courses, hear their frustration. So ultimately, it's frustrating the students. The curriculum needs to go hand in hand with people who feel comfortable with it and who know it. Curriculum is nothing unless the tutor or facilitator knows it.

Me: So curriculum development, even when the course is already prepared, includes a role for the instructor to develop the shape and the way they will make it their own and make it credible... What makes you credible? I'm hearing faculty development, there's a need.

Hannah: I think there's a big need. Again, I made the suggestion...I thought about proposing even a half time position in faculty development – just to go around and say "Okay, so now you're teaching in this particular model

we use... And I wanted to talk and find out what your needs are and I want to let you know what my observations are." We need to be accountable to the curriculum and to the program. We're seeing that in student evaluations. Some of the stuff that comes back through the evaluations is very, very different. So I think you need faculty development not only to develop a curriculum, but I think development of the terminology goes beyond the initial development. It's always being developed, it never stops. But now that we're heading in a whole new direction, and there will be more "development." Yeah, there had better be faculty development in place and I'm hoping a leadership role will be able to bring that out.

Our curriculum, I would say, has a lot of flexibility in it, and that I think makes it more open to constantly being developed. We, as instructors, are there and need to know that curriculum inside and out and need to know where to set the boundaries. We also keep the students within the boundaries of the curriculum but yet still give them room to be creative and to take that curriculum where they need it to go as well. And then of course bringing in the whole practice situation ...It's a growing tree, this development, it never stops.

Me: I presume that those boundaries you talked about – you have to be within those boundaries and it has to be an acceptable practice from a standards point of view. So when you talk faculty development, what I'm hearing is really a faculty development need inside the program that's unique to this discipline...

Hannah: And we definitely need that level, we're missing that. We have, I think, a very good level of college wide – the larger faculty development, but in terms of program, that's been lost...That's been lost in the budget. It's just been lost.

Me: *So where does the individual faculty allocation fit? There's the college wide activities and then there's the program wide activities and then there's the individual allocation. Has it got a role in your program and your curriculum development needs?*

Hannah: *I think there needs to be some other approach. Definitely. If everyone is doing their own faculty development, I think we need some definite consistency in things offered by the program. Having guest speakers come to college wide activities and they talk about critical thinking – it's valuable not only to a larger community college but I'm finding it very much so in the work that I'm doing, too.*

I would say use of the individual allocation is related to the position. I would say it's definitely related to the position and the person. Those who display initiative will actually do stuff directly in terms of getting their own development. They'll do their own research, going online, getting articles, reading, doing their own self study. They'll do that – some people will do that...Other people, at the end of the year, are running around trying to figure out how to spend their development allocation.

I think that you have to make time for faculty development. I don't think it's something that you take a week to think about what you want to do for faculty development, and another week to arrange it, another week to go. I think you have to constantly be thinking about it as a reflective sort of extra, you have to constantly be working on what you can bring to class. We do work hard, we work...so there's some days where we're working for not much, and there's other days where we work very, very hard. And when you get 44 vacation days a year, that's a lot, and we also have faculty development days too. So you're thinking about a plan ahead of time and implementing that, but there's no mechanism in place that you

can monitor that, and see what value people are bringing to the curriculum...or not...

Me: *...So that the professional faculty development is not a missing part, but is used to improve teaching?*

Hannah: *It's the foundation of teaching.*

As Hannah had indicated earlier, the curriculum in her area was largely developed prior to her arrival, and in reference to external standards. However, she seemed to have a strong sense that the role of the instructor included professional learning and subsequent re-working or redevelopment of the course at the classroom level on an ongoing basis.

Hannah's discussion of the role of faculty development in curriculum development appeared to have three levels, and each had had significant impact on her readiness to engage in the enhancement of pre-existing curriculum, and to teach with that curriculum. First, college wide faculty development had provided a broad perspective of college teaching and learning within which she could reflect on her own philosophy toward the curriculum and that of colleagues with differing philosophies. Second, the program level faculty development activities which Hannah had benefited from in her own first college teaching experience were now absent, and Hannah observed an impact on the ability to work effectively with the curriculum amongst newer faculty. Third, Hannah spoke to the need to use individual faculty development allocations in a thoughtful, professional manner that would ultimately influence the curriculum and benefit teaching.

John's observations on faculty development as part of our curriculum conversations came as references to shared activities that we had both been part of, and which had been focused quite specifically on instructional and curriculum development activity.

I mean, as someone with an education degree, I do remember taking those curriculum courses in university, but vaguely, you know? So when we do this stuff with faculty development, yeah, some of it I should know, but you know what? It's a lot more real and more useful when I'm working with it everyday! Trying to

develop the courses the way I think they should be, and using some of the topics and techniques we have worked with here in the workshops! So I guess I didn't pay enough attention in my education – now it seems important, and I'm ready to use these things in our curriculum! So I'm glad to be exposed to some of this stuff again...

Where Hannah's observations related to faculty development in the professional field were about needing to develop and sustain quality in the curriculum, John appeared to focus on the need for curriculum design skill.

Each of my more experienced participants also spoke voluntarily of faculty development playing a role in their perspective on curriculum development as they reflected on the re-storied narratives of John and Hannah, and on their own experience. Sacha spoke of how program level activities were geared to new faculty and new approaches to topics within the curriculum:

There's new faculty orientation because we're a huge program and last year someone did a session on collaboration, and somebody else did one on something else, and someone did one on another topic in common. It was really a valuable session on a PD day, but it was kind of a formal thing and there were only... everybody had so many minutes but we used to do it around a table more informally.

Sacha seemed to be expressing regret that actual faculty development sessions were needed to do the curriculum improvement that had traditionally come out of the teaching discussions amongst colleagues in the hall. But she went on to express her enjoyment and appreciation of what faculty development activities could bring to her work with her curriculum.

And we talk informally. But I have to say; there are two things that influence me. One is formal faculty development because you're always engaged in something or other and certainly interactive learning and collaborative learning have

always been my teaching style – but taking actual sessions has tightened up what I do in those areas and I probably incorporate them better than I used to. I'll make them more of a focus in materials from that. So firstly, I think faculty development things really do rejuvenate our enthusiasm for certain things. And the other thing is, I think I change some of what I do with the curriculum development by getting feedback from students – and getting a sense of what they're struggling with or what will make an assignment more accessible to them and then maybe changing from what I did before. And actually faculty development activities have helped me use some of the tools to get the student response – you know, the CATs (classroom assessment techniques) sessions, etc.

As another experienced instructor, Alex shared Sacha's enthusiasm for faculty development activity in preparing to be an instructor and to create a meaningful relationship with the curriculum in her discipline.

Alex: I'm a big fan and a big supporter and a big believer in the needs of faculty development and to tell my own personal story, like many other people, I have never really thought curriculum development. Well actually I had taught in the field, but in terms of formal teaching, I'd never done it. And it was obvious to me from early on, I think I was lucky – I maybe found a session or two that got me going, where I found people asking really useful questions and giving models and stuff that really helped me a lot. Then I thought...I need to know a whole bunch more to lead this program...

So I'd say to any newer faculty member, take advantage and if one thing offered doesn't suit you, and that's one of the things that pisses me off right – people who inform me....

Me: That it's not there.

Alex: That it's not there, but they don't articulate what it is they want...because it obviously doesn't come with your discipline area stamped on it, it comes in terms of what help people need. It's about models or it's about planning or it's about people asking the same questions – that sort of affirming, "yeah, at least I'm looking for the right things."

Alex spoke of her role in a smaller program, and the value of faculty development in a role that can be somewhat isolated from the energy and collaboration Sacha had spoken of in her program, albeit with concern that it was diminishing.

And a whole bunch of it for me – I have way too much power and control. I meet with myself and say "Hmmn...what should we do now?" I'm good at coming up with 52 alternatives and that's paralyzing. It was in many cases the opportunity even to have dialogue with colleagues that happens naturally in those faculty development sessions. It wasn't in many cases so much about the model or the information as it was colleagues and suddenly I went "Okay, I can bounce this off them and get some feedback...."

My inquiries of my newer colleagues regarding the supports in place or needed for their curriculum development role had very readily drawn observations regarding faculty development, both the college wide, centrally planned activities as well as program level and individual level activity. But it wasn't until a conversation with Alex on faculty development that other formal supports for curriculum development were named.

Alex: Well I think, Joan, of course you do have faculty development, but we have seen in the last five or six years right, there's now (program services), and they're now able to support us... so a structure had evolved and I think that many people when asked that question about what helped them in curriculum development, they'd say who helped them...like the people in these support departments, we identified those people, not faculty development.

I've seen an evolution in our culture, right, and a lot of the people who've come on more recently or have been under pressure to change, it interests me because it's different than what my involvement is – because I'm more from the old group where you kind of figure it out on your own. But a lot of them, when they think of curriculum and change they think "we need to make some changes so the first thing to do is call (program services)", and I kind of go "Oh, well I guess that is...." and it's not that I'm opposed to it, it's just interesting that I wouldn't start there.

Despite Alex's sense that newer faculty would more immediately look to these other supports when engaging in curriculum development, this had not been the experience of Hannah or John, nor had it been voiced when speaking with Sacha. Alex and I spoke about the faculty perceptions of program service and instructional design units within the college, and acknowledged that instructors seeking college approval of new curriculum were obliged to work with these areas in a way that those engaged in ongoing curriculum efforts at the classroom level were not. Perhaps there is a perception breakdown between how these units view the services they offer, and that of faculty members who might or might now be compelled to use them? Alex spoke of the service providers in program services...

...But see, they don't see their role just as being the formatting and going through the hoops people. They see their role as very much being facilitator...And hung up with curriculum development.

She continued, speaking of the role of the instructional design unit.

But then we already have a curriculum to use. There's a whole other area of development – new program development – if we want to talk on an organizational level, right. My view on that because this is a big joke now ...we were in such a panic about the whole technology thing, I just kind of said "We'll use the technicians and they'll figure out how to make it work

better." But of course the minute you got to know them and start to work with them, you went "oh, okay, these people are...?"

Me: *They're course designers.*

Alex: *Yeah, they're instructional designers and because we've worked with them – I've worked with all of them – over the last few years, I really appreciate that they are trained and they do know that role.*

Me: *I mean we tend to think we're going to have those conversations about what should be in the course before we land on their doorstep – not to say that they could have come and facilitated the conversation, but we tend to think we'll have our conversations and then we'll go to them afterwards with our ideas...*

Alex: *Yeah. Yeah. And I was kind of like you, I sort of thought we had to figure it all out and then go to them....*

Alex and I reflected on how and why faculty development and instructional design and service areas were regarded so differently by instructors.

Me: *...one view of faculty development is that it's always seen as being nothing but a good news kind of thing.*

Alex: *That's right! They're great people that put on great stuff, they'll do it if you need it, they don't charge you big bucks. Whereas...and sadly for other areas because they do good stuff and have wonderful work, we just mostly can't afford it. They've gone to a partially shared costs sort of model. I don't really understand where their money comes from, but boy I do know it costs! and that's something we're going to have to fight about! But this time, it was like nothing, it was like "Of course you're going to have that, there she is!" And I'm like "Okay, I'm not asking for it..." and now she'll work with us on five courses and something shifted because the first round, boy it was like another 15 minutes of her time would break the bank!*

These observations reminded me of an experience that had clear parallels.

About 12 years ago, I was been invited to pilot the use of computer managed learning (CML) in our program. I was course coordinator for two of our required first year, survey style courses. Each had multiple sections in our program and was also offered as a service course to other programs within the business division. As such, the idea, I suppose, was that there would be a significant amount of use of the system, thereby providing a useful pilot study of how we might use this technology to support learning and our curriculum.

We were currently using a number of quizzes in class time to test across a broad range of learning objectives typical of many survey courses. The idea of taking back that class time, and having students complete the quizzes on computer on their own time appealed to instructors teaching these two courses, and we quickly re-designed the class time and evaluation structure to take advantage of this opportunity. Perceived benefits to students included a flexible schedule on which to complete the quizzes, multiple opportunities to be tested on the same material with only the best score counting, and immediate evaluation feedback and results.

Instructional design and support from the related service unit were freely provided for this project, and there was considerable investment of time and energy on the part of our program and from me.

The first year unfolded with numerous bumps and learning opportunities along the way, but at the end of it, we (meaning my program and me) were keen to continue on with the use of CML in the program. We had made considerable steps in terms of understanding our own needs and our use of the technology, and were also cognizant of the investment we had already made. However, from the second year on, we have also paid a considerable price tag each year. The terms and conditions of the technology use have changed, and we have continued to improve

our use of this technology for the students' benefit, but the costs of doing it have been significant. Where I had once believed that services that support CML would be provided under a centralized funding model, we have continued to see a user pay model of service. My program has, I think, made a considerable contribution to the development of the CML model currently used, with increasingly high quality facilities, lab supervision, and staffing. We have long since been surpassed by other program areas in terms of the number of courses and students we provide with CML service, but have continued to use the technology, and pay our part for the support services each year.

I often wonder about this in terms of motivation...what is the incentive to be involved in innovative curriculum activities if we are constantly wondering if these innovations can or will be sustained?

What interests me in my colleagues' comments and my own story is that faculty development had been consistently experienced as a positive, supportive agency in improving curriculum through the development of both discipline and teaching focused activities. On the other hand, programs and services, at first glance more specifically geared to curriculum development, were only referred to by one colleague, and with the mixed feelings and perceptions that I shared in terms of the advantages and disadvantages, costs and benefits of using these other services. This prompts me to reflect on how we, as faculty members, view collegial, faculty led experiences in comparison with more administratively directed curriculum development services.

Drawing Closure to the Conversations

It is now more than a year since I began my conversations with colleagues regarding their experiences with curriculum development. While I have a need to draw these conversations to a close, and move to a different stage in my reflections, my colleagues' stories continue. Each of us continues to work at the college, although changes in role

have been experienced by a number of us. Perhaps more significant changes may be seen in the outward landscape on which these stories continue – degree granting status has been passed through legislation to colleges in Alberta, and curriculum development activities have taken on new force and energy. Things do not stay the same, but I reflect on what I have heard from my colleagues, and from my own experience, to move to the next stage in exploring the significance of these stories.

CHAPTER V: REFLECTION ON THE THEMES AND RE-VIEWING THE LITERATURE

As I prepared to write about the themes of our conversations I was at first struck by the echoes I heard when I reflected on other's stories, and then by how different they were from mine, how different my life from theirs. I thought of the circumstances that brought us into this three dimensional study space at the same time. Each of us – my two primary participants, three reflective colleagues, and myself – are employed as instructors of adult learners in an urban college setting, and have chosen to pursue this work as our career. We care deeply about our college and the work that we do. We have worked outside the college in other areas of endeavour and brought what we know and value and believe to be important with us when we came in the door, and have intersected in this space. Yet, we are of different ages and stages, genders and professions, outlooks and aspirations. We will each go on, move through and out of this study space, leaving a richness of story and experience that I am honoured to have shared with them, and grateful to be able to reflect upon.

The Landscape is Changing

One of the important precepts for this study is that the experiences of newer faculty members be reflected upon by more experienced colleagues. It would be unlikely, of course, that their experiences be identical, but I had hoped, given my own tenure with the college, that there would be thematic resonance and thus has been the case. However, I do wonder about the degree that we can look for the future to offer dramatically different experiences for faculty members. While the outside forces always play a part in shaping internal response at an educational institution, at times the internal college stability has resulted in some shared experiences across professional generations. However, the external landscape at present is not experiencing a slow evolution so much as a tectonic shift. One would be hard pressed to think of a change more significant in terms of college mission and mandate, more radical than has been signaled by the passing of Bill 43 by

the Government of Alberta – opening the door to colleges and technical institutes becoming four year baccalaureate degree granting institutions.

Despite this significant change in what the college offers to its community, I believe our values remain constant, and that the quality of the teaching and learning experience will be the pre-eminent factor on which we move forward. There is a great deal of administrative activity geared to "readiness" – a term more widely used in the past 18 months than I had experienced in my first 18 years at the college! In our regular vehicles of communication, we have become used to college readiness updates on where we are relative to accreditation measures under this newly applied piece of legislation. Even prior to the articulation of specific measures under which colleges will be assessed and evaluated to be ready to grant degrees, we have been, as are other colleges, examining our readiness to meet accreditation standards as part of offering 4 year degrees. This is an interesting example of curriculum development in my expansive definition of curriculum. Certainly, these factors, such as library holdings, registration process, or qualifications of faculty all have the potential to have profound impact on the student experience, and attention to these measures seems a logical anticipation, at the administrative level, of student learning activity.

In the midst of this, we have spent a fair amount of time on nomenclature, including a name change precipitating much of the activity at the public level of visibility. In 2001, our college dropped the term "community" from its name. I sometimes wonder about the degree to which the general public, and future students, pay much attention to things of this nature, until such time as they, the potential students, begin to look at issues of stature or credibility of the program they might enroll in. Other names have come under scrutiny and been subject to change as well. I have taught, since beginning with the college, in a Division. With no change in my location or view, I now teach in a School. Similarly, other divisions within the college have made name changes to schools or faculties.

The implications of these name changes suggest a greater connection to a more academic professional collegial mandate, and from my perspective, create public awareness of the intention to move into higher levels of academic credentialing. These visible measures signal further shifts in the more embedded cultural values and beliefs of the institution. Research has become part of the institutional language with a policy on research activity, a research office, and support mechanisms for research activity, albeit only insofar as the research supports the primary mandate of teaching. The demographics of our faculty contingent has shifted to a significantly greater number of teaching positions requiring a PhD, with the last faculty agreement including additional grid steps to attract qualified people to these positions. These and other changes create a different teaching environment, requiring increased attention to how we develop and teach curriculum under new and different conditions.

In many ways, these changes in mission, vision, and culture would appear to create new ways of envisioning what a college is in our community. Throughout this study, and indeed at other times, I have been interested in how the term "college" is so widely used. In reviewing literature, for example, it has been important for me to see the distinctions between Canadian and American uses of the terms "community college." At this stage, I would hazard the opinion that we have evolved into a college that somehow is bridging the American definitions of community college, two year college, and four year college in terms of what our college is preparing to offer: one and two year vocational programs, two year transfer programs, and four year baccalaureate degrees.

This scope would seem to provide, amongst other things, a breadth of curricula we have not worked with before, hence, presenting us with new and interesting possibilities and challenges. For, indeed, despite administrative management of many of the readiness factors, it is faculty who will create, and continually develop the curriculum. So how will my colleagues and I experience this new future? What do our experiences tell us about curriculum development? This inquiry has taken place at a dynamic time, at the cusp of this new era for college development and growth. There is foreshadowing in my

colleagues' stories, as they are at the beginning of how this may affect their positions, their programs, their fields of work. In light of this, many of the experiences seem both reflective and anticipatory – reflecting on experiences, which describe things that have happened, and some anticipation of how these past experiences will be paralleled by changing conditions in the future. We live in interesting times!

A Word on Curriculum Development

One of the first concerns to emerge, even as I asked my participants to work with me, was reflected in each of them saying, " I don't really work with curriculum development" or "I've never really thought about curriculum development." This appears to me to come out of what college instructors see as their job, or what they think is the job of other people at the college. This could have been a dissertation about instructional designers at a college, and therefore a different window on the world of college curriculum development, but it isn't. I am interested in the experience of college instructors as they prepare to teach, and reflect on what they teach, and how this is or isn't viewed as curriculum development. I am interested in the relationship they create and maintain with the curriculum in their course, how it comes to be, what happens along the way, the tension, frustrations, and inspirations that unfold as they work to improve what they teach. Rather than immediately discuss what we do, then, I began in each case with a question to Hannah and to John about how they would define curriculum and then curriculum development. This led very quickly to conversations about what they were doing or what happened in their area that they viewed as curriculum development, and in most cases activity that they were part of, or strongly felt they should be part of. They spoke of individual efforts they made, sometimes purposefully held away from the view of others as they planned new activities to try in a class, with the results to be shared in a larger realm following some experience with an idea; they spoke of times they were part of larger activities where impacts were felt on a much broader scale. They spoke of what they thought, and how they felt, and what they did, and what they expected when they first began their teaching with the college, and of experiences further back than that

which had shaped their views. They spoke of things they were currently doing, and activities and roles that they were anticipating, at times with joy, and occasionally with something approaching trepidation. We moved between the internal, personal experiences and the social, public experiences; from the past through the present and into the future, ebbing and flowing, back and forth.

It seems a significant point to me that, as instructors, we don't immediately describe our work as doing curriculum development, but when asked about it, we can quickly think of ways that, in fact we do develop curriculum. Is this because of the words used? And the way they are used in our context? As I noted earlier in this work,

> *Curriculum Development* is generally characterized by efforts which are intentional and collaborative, and which focus on making choices about what "needs to be covered," how to "cover it," and how to evaluate student progress, all located within courses and programs of study. . .*Program Planning* and *Program Development* are used within the college to indicate larger planning activities, within which curriculum development may fit.

While my understanding of the word "curriculum" is very broad and encompasses all that the students experience in our learning environment, even use of the definition of curriculum development above creates considerable space for college instructors to act within what they might think of as being the normal realm of teaching and be, therefore, part of the curriculum development process. Curriculum development is not an event, it is a process – very much in parallel with the distinction one makes in terms of faculty development being an ongoing process. These processes of faculty development and curriculum development undertaken by an instructor shape an instructor's learning and relationship with curriculum, and it is this intersection which provides the entry point to re-examining the emergent themes from the previous discussion of our stories.

Faculty Development

Although I began this inquiry with faculty development simply as an idea about how the process of curriculum development might be supported, I feel as if it has become a

parallel for curriculum development itself. When I apply my sense of curriculum and its breadth to this discussion, it becomes obvious to me that if the instructor is the curriculum, then all that develops the instructor is curriculum development. This is too simplistic, and yet I feel within me that it is the right starting place to explore my reflections about the emergent themes in the experience of curriculum development. Why? Because we are an organization geared toward learning, if not yet a learning organization, we are naturally inclined toward examining what we need to learn to answer questions. It seems for me to be a way of living to explore what needs to be learned, or what has been learned within an experience or has been demanded by the experience. Change and new experiences or situations demand learning, as suggested by Gibson-Harmon, Rodriguez and Haworth:

> ...community college missions have evolved greatly, as have the perceptions of just what makes up the "community" each should be serving. A diverse cadre of educated professionals is needed to carry out this evolving mission. In addition, some experts would argue that conceptions of community college quality should be gauged not only by student learning outcomes but also by employees' professional growth and their sense of being valued. Indeed, creating a learning environment for both students and college employees may well be an additional aspect of the community college's evolving mission. (2002, p. 77)

Our very ability to adapt successfully and to respond to the changing needs of our community argue for a learning environment within which our own development as faculty members enhances the learning of the student. Who are the curriculum leaders? Who is most responsible? Even as we look across the context, from whole new programs in degree areas – horizons which are very new to our college, right to the daily preparation of what "goes into the classroom" for ongoing diploma courses, I know it is my faculty colleagues who are ultimately responsible. As much as there is administrative groundwork to make all these things possible, it is the instructor who creates the connection between the discipline, and its body of knowledge, and the meaningful experience for the student. We take this responsibility very seriously – it is our calling and we feel keenly aware of our successes and failures. People develop curriculum. It is developed, shaped, enhanced, enlivened and embodied not by models, or processes, or

templates, but by people. If indeed college quality is gauged by employees' professional growth as suggested by Gibson-Harman et al., and instructors are uniquely situated in the process of curriculum development, faculty development and curriculum development have a deeply symbiotic relationship.

Gibson-Harman, Rodriguez, and Haworth, in their meta-analysis of literature on professional development at colleges, describe a human resource challenge facing community colleges, and elaborate on the key characteristics of that challenge.

> There is considerable consensus that three unfolding developments – a shortage of qualified faculty to meet growing student demand, a movement toward a "learning paradigm" in community colleges, and the pervasive influence of technology – will leave a lasting imprint on a new generation of community college faculty. (2002, p. 77)

While speaking of the American community college context and the faculty development responses these issues demand, there is a strong resonance in my context and this creates, for me, a logical framework within which to reflect on my experience and that of my participant colleagues as they have shared it with me. It appears to capture some of our concerns about our own professional development and preparation to develop curriculum, and allow room for exploration of some of the themes that emerge from our stories.

Faculty Shortfall

The first of the issues raised by Gibson-Harman and colleagues (2002) is the likely shortfall in the numbers of qualified college faculty. Citing numerous writers, the authors argue that the juxtaposition of retiring faculty and the growth in the youth cohort entering post-secondary education "presents a serious challenge to community college leaders, who may find themselves hard-pressed to identify talented community college faculty who are adequately prepared to address the needs of an increasingly diverse student population" (p. 78). The Canadian experience parallels this anticipated challenge, with the population of 18 to 21 year-olds in Canada growing by 2.5% in the past 4 years, while undergraduate enrollment soared by 25 percent (AUCC, 2004, p. 1). The Association of

Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) further suggests a postsecondary need to replace 20,000 faculty members, and hire 20,000 more by 2011 (2004b, p. 1). Gibson-Harman et al. conclude from the literature that strategies for dealing with this anticipated shortfall mainly emphasize one of three themes: developing and strengthening graduate preparation programs for prospective community college faculty, enriching current faculty development efforts, and recruiting and developing part-time instructors into the ranks of full-time teaching faculty (p. 79).

From considering the above, and reflecting on my experiences as well as those of my participant colleagues, I recognized some strong interconnections between our stories and the ideas presenting themselves on the larger landscape. While I did not know this at the outset of the inquiry, and the participants were not selected based on this characteristic, it seems significant to me that each of us had engaged in graduate level education that would specifically prepare us to be college level instructors, thus connecting to the first strategy. I wonder if this makes each of us the advocates for curriculum development that we are, or drew me to each of these colleagues simply because they were better prepared to speak of curriculum than colleagues with only discipline specific backgrounds? Certainly, as the college heads into higher levels of credentialing, further levels of study and advanced degrees will not be optional for faculty members, but will this yield instructors who are better prepared to teach or develop curriculum?

I am, however, particularly interested in considering the second strategy for dealing with this anticipated shortfall – that of strengthening existing professional development programs, particularly with respect to those geared to the new faculty member.

> Perhaps the most consistent theme in the literature has been the need for administrators and faculty to embrace the idea of "one faculty," providing professional development programs that involve full- and part-time faculty in collaborative efforts, often through mentoring programs that pair more experienced full-time faculty with less experienced part-time instructors. (Gibson-Harman et al., 2002, p. 80, citing Gappa and Leslie, 1997; Roueche, Roueche, and Milliron, 1995)

Each of my participants had spoken of the significance of a mentoring or mentoring type role; Hannah had experienced a mentoring program as she entered into teaching at the college, my reflective participants all spoke of mentoring roles they had played as part of their experience, and John, although not using the word "mentoring" referred to a trusted colleague who had been the entry point to his college teaching, and to whom he continued to look as a source of information and support. My own experience in first teaching for the college included what I might think of now as a mentor. When I began teaching in an off-site setting, away from the main college campus, access to the program co-coordinator on site allowed this guiding role to be easily available to me, and I grew in the role with the support of this person.

Whether serving in a very specific "what you might do in this teaching situation" capacity, through to articulating a mission and philosophy of college teaching, I believe these mentoring experiences play a strong part in clarifying our role as college instructors, and with establishing our connection to and identity with the college. This connects to another enhancement of professional development programs which Gibson-Harman et al. suggest will serve to combat the faculty shortfall challenge – meeting…

> …the need to provide new faculty with a sound understanding of the mission and purpose of community colleges as an important strategy for retaining and enhancing faculty effectiveness. They [citing DuBois, 1993: Higgins, Hawthorne, Cape, and Bell, 1995] cite a growing body of evidence that community college faculty who understand and accept the mission of their institutions often hold more positive attitudes toward their work and teach more effectively. (2002, p. 80)

This idea of coming to understand the mission of the college through faculty development is addressed by Welch (2002), who suggests a model for a new faculty orientation program, with the program goals being to:

> Model a learner-centered environment and set the stage for new faculty to be learning centered;
> Enable new faculty to be knowledgeable about the college, its campuses, its programs and its services;

> Encourage new faculty to be collegial, involved in college and campus arenas, and have experiences and relationships with colleagues at other locations and in other departments; and
> Establish expectations for new faculty to maintain vitality and to continue their professional growth as they move through their careers. (p. 12)

As I consider my colleague's stories and reflections about faculty development in our lives, I am reminded of very specific examples where we looked to faculty development activities to fulfill at least the latter three of these objectives. This seeking out of information and connection on our part may have, in some cases, happened long after we would be considered "new faculty." Each of my reflective colleagues and I would have started with the college prior to when our orientation program for new faculty was created, so it would have been self selection that led us to use faculty development to fulfill our own needs in the above areas. And while a strong new faculty orientation program has been put into place, it has become almost a rite of passage for people who are gaining continuing appointment, or permanent status at the college, rather than a wide open event for all comers. While anyone is welcome to attend, the recommendation may not be made, or the value of the event not communicated by program chairs, unless the person is being hired into a full-time permanent position, in which case attendance becomes a requirement of the appointment. This leaves many new part-time people without this experience, and seems to widen the gap between the status and identity of the full versus part-time faculty members. It certainly does not embody what Gibson-Harman and colleagues (2002) referred to as the "one faculty" ideal. It is interesting to me, however, that one reason Welch advocates for the suggested model of new faculty orientation is some apparent concern with the job that actual departments are doing:

> It is typically within an academic department that a faculty member is introduced to the expectations for good job performance, the role of a faculty member at an institution, committee work, and colleagues. In short, the role of the new faculty member is often defined by the department in which the new faculty member is housed and not by the college. Therefore, many new faculty members will likely adopt the habits, philosophy, and view of the college laid out by department colleagues. (2002, p. 15)

While I agree that this is entirely likely, there is a strong implicit suggestion that this is a bad thing. This causes me to reflect on my experience and that of my participants, and see the tension in not having both college wide and department or program specific new faculty development in place. Surely it is not to be a choice between one or other? Can we not reasonably expect both? The clear theme to me in our experiences was the need to be able to connect with the wider college context, but also in a way that locates the discipline specific practice within that setting. Hannah, Sacha, and I all come from programs of some considerable size, and very specifically appreciated past practices that assisted new faculty members in coming into their role in the program and making connections to the curriculum. To some degree each of us mourns the loss of such efforts through budget restrictions, dramatic growth, and scrambling to put bodies in front of classes. Clear themes emerged in my conversations with all my participant colleagues regarding the relationship between college mission, philosophy, collaborative effort, and curriculum development, and to not have, or sustain, or protect both program specific and college wide vehicles that assist the newer faculty member, and enhance the relationship between newer and more experienced instructors, seems an incalculable loss, and one which, to my mind, has an inevitable negative impact on curriculum development efforts.

The third strategy Gibson-Harman et al. identify for dealing with the predicted faculty shortfall is that of recruiting and developing part-time instructors (2002, p. 79). They state that there has been concern about use of part-time faculty; however, they note that "although a certain scholarship developed around the emerging national issue of part-time faculty in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the topic has waned considerably in popularity among community college scholars since then" (p. 80). It would appear, then, from the writing these authors have surveyed, that the business case for hiring part-time instructors (flexibility in staffing, lower wage and benefit costs, lower support costs) has won out over the educational benefits of fully integrated full-time faculty. This would certainly capture the experience at my college, where, despite significant full-time faculty recruitment in growth areas, the proportion of part-time instructors has risen substantially over the last several years. Leaving aside the issue of commitment and its impact on

curriculum development for the moment, I wonder if we are prepared to support through professional development this strategy for dealing with the suggested faculty shortfall. Again, even assuming that part-time instructors are committed to working toward developing curriculum, does our professional development structure support their needs? Reflecting on my conversations with my participants, my sense from their story and my own is that it does not. The tensions expressed earlier regarding the lack of structures to support new faculty, particularly at the program level, certainly extend to this new growth in part-time instructors, who face additional challenges participating in available opportunities simply due to being less than full time on campus. As expressed by Burnstad (2002) in her analysis of a successful part-time faculty development program at a community college in Kansas, typically "part-timers have strong feelings about whether they are or are not 'connected' to or 'integrated' into campus life. For the most part they feel powerless, alienated, invisible, and second class" (2002, p. 17, citing Gappa and Leslie, 1993, p. 180). The program described by Burnstad aims at creating this integration for part-time instructors, and features the following elements:

> Context (space, amenities, support, salary, supervision, performance review and feedback, a voice, curriculum development, and textbook selection);
> Institution-wide and Department Initiatives (orientation, refresher orientation, department orientation, department meetings),
> Professional Development,
> Adjunct Certification Training Program,
> Valuable Resources, and
> Institutional Commitment (pp.18 - 24).

In reviewing this program I hear echoes of conversations with each of my participants on how desirable many of these things were as they were experienced, or more commonly, the expression of concern over their absence even for full-time faculty, never mind part-time colleagues.

In suggesting a faculty shortfall as one of three significant trends, Gibson-Harman et al. (2002) identify graduate preparation to teach at a community college, enriched professional development programs, and increased use of part-time faculty as strategies

widely considered to combat that shortfall. My comfort in using this discussion to frame my conversations with my participants lies in the strong intersections between our experience and the strategies proposed. I believe our ability to meaningfully engage in curriculum development stems from our professional development, and certainly our educational preparation for the role, our involvement with existing professional development, and our experience as part-time or with part-time faculty are integral elements of this development. While we may or may not have experienced these dimensions as a result of the faculty shortfall described by Gibson-Harman et al. (2002), I think this trend and our experience thus far suggest some interesting implications for future consideration.

A Shift to a Learning Paradigm

The second key development identified by Gibson-Harman et al. – creating a human resource challenge for community colleges – is perhaps more obviously or directly related to curriculum development. They identify a shift to a "learning paradigm" which has stressed the need to place "learning first in every policy, program, and practice in higher education by overhauling the traditional architecture of education" (p. 80, citing O'Banion, 1997). Levine (2000) has argued that the learning revolution fundamentally reconceptualizes "how college is taught," emphasizing outcomes- and competency-based frameworks that elevate the centrality of learning (as cited in Gibson-Harman et al., p. 81). Gibson-Harman et al. continue, writing that

> Other authors have likewise indicated that the learning paradigm has prompted faculty and administrators to adopt competency based curricula, collaborative and cooperative learning, and technology… as effective strategies for "customizing learning" to the specific needs of a diverse student clientele. (p. 81, citing Boggs, 1999; Batson and Bass, 1996)

This paradigmatic shift will create, or perhaps already has created, a fundamental change in the role of the college instructor as a consequence. According to McClenney (1998),

> …faculty in the early twenty-first century will assume new roles, spending "less time preparing and professing, and more time facilitating reflection, making

> meaning, and sharing wisdom – managing the process of education." (¶ 25, as cited in Gibson-Harman et al., pp. 81- 82)

As I consider the impact of this identified shift in my context, two stories immediately come to mind: Hannah telling how she has struggled to explain not the content but the process of her program's curriculum, and John's story of trying to convince others to teach a particular topic in a new way. On one hand Hannah's story appears to exemplify one of the challenges of a program's decision to embrace the paradigm shift to an outcomes-based curriculum, specifically, the difficulty in explaining to key stakeholders the re-designed, and perhaps somewhat unfamiliar, processes that lead to the desired outcomes in the curriculum – stakeholders including potential and actual students, new instructors, even members of the employment community. By contrast, John's experience, which is closer to my own of a program with faculty at various places relative to this paradigm shift, and having difficulty negotiating the curriculum choices with our program colleagues. While this certainly has intersections with the other key themes – leadership, power, commitment and status – it seems to speak initially of a learning need on our part. How can we manage the impacts of this shift, or manage making the shift itself, if we are unable to speak to one another because we don't understand our own place in this changing landscape, or because we don't see this as a paradigm shift, but only as a clash of personal or professional teaching styles?

I wonder if we in the college community are ready for this shift in terms of what it means for the instructor, not only in the in-class role, but in the curriculum development role. While this shift has implications across the college, this idea seems to intersect in a powerful way with the concern about faculty shortfalls and the recruitment of part-time instructors. Instructors are influenced in their relationship to what they teach by their own history, and how they came into their relationship with the curriculum at earlier stages of their own learning in the discipline. To some degree, I expect this influences all of us in how we develop and shape the learning experience for the student. Indeed, my experience, that of my participant colleagues, and of my colleagues generally, suggests that we are brought into the college because of this pre-existing relationship with the

discipline, and are likely, therefore, to have assumptions about the nature of the curriculum and our intended relationship with it. When the role of the college instructor is changing as dramatically as the research and literature suggest, a reliance on our past experience will be incomplete preparation for teaching a new generation to a greater degree than ever before. To shift to a facilitator role, to be a manager of the learning experience and the learning environment rather than be the source of information and knowledge, will require new learning practices and behaviour from instructors. This shift is a profoundly important dimension of curriculum development – a monumental challenge for full-time instructors in their chosen career, but how much more so for part-time instructors? Is faculty development, at any level, prepared to support all instructors, regardless of category, to adapt to the shifting paradigm? To even expect that part-time instructors are fully aware that this paradigm shift has taken place, never mind to adjust accordingly, may be beyond the scope of current faculty development activities.

Curriculum Development, Faculty Development and Technology Use

The shifting paradigm discussed above may in large part be attributed to the societal shift from an industrial to an information-based age. Beyond the need to identify and accept that this paradigm shift is happening, faculty will need to make use of new tools to develop and adapt their curriculum, with a strong emphasis on information technologies. The challenge is that ". . . one of the greatest thrusts of faculty development at community colleges will need to be centered around faculty preparation for technology-assisted course design and delivery" (Carlson, 2000: Shave, 1998; as cited by Gibson-Harman, et al., 2002). The volume of writing on college education in the Internet age is staggering, and in an excerpt from their meta-analysis of research on faculty development, Gibson-Harman et al. (p. 83) capture, for me, the significance of faculty development for the curriculum development role of college instructors:

> For many community college faculty, often out of step with the demands of educational technology (Dickenson, 1999), philosophical changes regarding course design and delivery may be required. The learning lifestyles of many community college students are steadily becoming entrenched in computer technology prior to their arrival at college (Olsen, 2000; Townsend, 1997). If

> students are less receptive to faculty lectures that do not incorporate Internet resources and if the majority of freshman students on some college campuses are using the Internet for academic research, then faculty may be compelled to work hard to "keep ahead of the kids" (Olsen, 2000, p. A39). This all points to the idea that faculty roles will have to evolve from teachers to designers of learning experiences, processes and environments – an evolution that will require a major change in how teachers are prepared and trained. (Katz and others, 1999; Keating and Hargitai, 1999)

Responding to the Challenges

Using the structure provided by the Gibson-Harman et al. (2002), the key challenges include an impending faculty shortfall, a shifting learning paradigm, and the challenge of preparing faculty to make more effective use of technology. The experiences of my colleagues and myself would seem to mirror these challenges, and yet my sense of concern about how they are being addressed creates an equally powerful emotional response in me. In a recent study of 300 publicly supported two-year colleges in the United States, Grant and Keim (2002) concluded that "organizational and curricular practices are more widespread than traditional activities of sabbatical leaves and travel funds, implying that college are as focused on institutional mission and teaching and learning in the classroom, as they are on enhancement of faculty knowledge" (p. 802). While it seems my colleagues and I see a parallel between our experiences and those of the wider college educational community, our experience of the resolution or attention to meeting these challenges does not run parallel to the experience of others. Even as we grow aware of our own changing faculty development opportunities, and of our ability to access a wider array of services within our own college, there is a sense of losing ground in keeping up with the challenges.

Faculty Development and Curriculum Development – Closure to this Conversation

My sense of the interconnectedness of faculty development and curriculum development as a starting point in this inquiry has been strongly reinforced by our stories of our experiences. The emergence of this theme as foundational to further discussion of curriculum development is punctuated with tension and concern. Recent literature reflects

the challenges faced by colleges, and the role of faculty development in meeting these challenges to ensure quality of curriculum, and yet experiences in this inquiry suggest that faculty development opportunities at various levels are not keeping pace, and even the most enthusiastic participants in those opportunities feel under-prepared. In being able to maintain a meaningful relationship to our curriculum, and the ability to shape it to meet the needs of our students, our own ability to learn and change must be maintained and enhanced. Concerns expressed by participants in this inquiry that faculty development be an ongoing, integral part of curriculum development are echoed throughout the literature, and succinctly captured, I think, in a study of motivation and faculty development by Wallin (2003), who states that "professional development should not be limited to a specific day, a three-hour workshop, or a four-credit course. Rather, professional development, like good education, goes on indefinitely" (p. 322).

If this is to be the case, and my experience and that of my participants would surely wish it so, we look to leadership to both provide the opportunities to learn what we need in order to undertake this task, and to support an environment in which we can engage in, and provide leadership to, curriculum development itself.

Leadership

Leadership quickly emerged as a recurrent theme in my curriculum conversations, with questions about what we experience as leadership in the curriculum development process, as well as of leadership outside and in support of the process, enabling the activities of curriculum development to unfold productively.

Continuing from the discussion of faculty development, the connection between that theme and leadership is made by Wallin in the aforementioned study, which examined motivation and faculty development through the lens of leadership perceptions of professional development needs in selected colleges and technical institutes. While finding that motivation for engagement in professional development needed to come

from within the faculty member, Wallin suggests that "presidents and academic administrators must lead by providing diverse opportunities and resources for diverse learners and needs" (2003, p. 322). This question of what comes from within, versus what we expect from outside seems to resonate throughout this conversation of curriculum development and leadership.

Certainly there is an expectation of leadership both from those who influence our world and of ourselves as educators. I believe the degree to which we look outward or inward connects to where we are in our teaching career. My participant colleagues who were newer in their college teaching careers looked to leadership to create the openings, both literally and figuratively, for them to participate in the process of curriculum development, and to set the philosophical standards that should guide the process. This parallels my experience in the earlier years of my teaching with the college, while I now see myself clearly reflected in the comments expressed by my more experienced colleagues. At this later stage we clearly expect to lead the process, and from those further up the hierarchy we look for support and autonomy to do so.

The Dean as Curriculum Leader

What does leadership mean in the process of curriculum development, and where does it come from? Erwin (2000) creates a strong argument for the dean as chief academic officer, stating that

> [t]he chief academic officer (CAO) at a college is the person primarily responsible for its instructional integrity and curriculum development. Each college needs a single individual who has primary accountability for instruction. In this new millennium, colleges face not only constant change but also the challenge of increased speed of change. An explosion of advances makes it incumbent on the CAO to be informed, flexible, and technologically knowledgeable in the emerging academic world. (p. 9)

The dean of a college faculty or school is the senior level of academic responsibility in this semi-autonomous structure; in effect becoming the individual who has primary responsibility as described by Erwin. The dean is the link between faculty and other

levels of administration, to other schools or faculties within the structure, and to external parties for communication and negotiation purposes. This locates the dean at a strategically significant place to have profound influence over the curriculum while not being directly involved in its creation or ongoing development. As described by Erwin,

> [a] primary task of the CAO is to ensure that the college has properly conducted its curriculum development with respect to internal and state regulations. This is a daunting task when a college catalogue is revised every year or two. As technologies and subject areas advance, the need for curriculum changes is paramount. The CAO needs to apply the regulations and inform the curriculum approval process in such a manner as to encourage course improvements while maintaining the college checkpoints in the approval process. (2000, p. 12)

At the same time, faculty see themselves as uniquely positioned to decide what and how to teach based on their discipline connections and proximity to students and classroom. These positions seem to me to create the potential for either a very workable division of labour or a tense and anxious struggle, based on the nature of the leadership provided by the senior role. Andrews (2000) addresses this situation, describing the role of the dean:

> The dean's role is a pressure role. Changes in curriculum, negotiations for salaries and working conditions for faculty, issues of excellence in the classroom, and finding funding to support the needs and efforts of the faculty create a pressure-cooker atmosphere of issues and needs within the institution. The dean becomes the person who blends these issues and needs in order to make outstanding teaching and learning the outcome of the institution. (p. 19)

Based on the dramatically changing landscape of college education, and my experience of working with both faculty and administration over time, Erwin's advocacy of participatory leadership in academic matters makes sense to me.

> Participatory leadership is characterized by an open campus, shared vision, and the value that people are the most important part of the institution. Leaders are motivated to listen to employee ideas, they encourage open information and faculty and staff development, and they exude trust and confidence. Problem solving, not fear and blame, is the focus of participatory management. (2000, p. 10)

As I consider my newer colleague participants, and their expectations of the institution and its leadership, they describe mixed feelings, with each, at times, expressing a range

from hope and cautious optimism to skepticism and even cynicism. This lack of certainty creates a tension that I don't hear in the stories of my more senior colleagues as they reflect on the same situations; their confidence about what leadership they bring and how it can be used to create positive outcomes clearly comes through. I, too, share this sense of comfort that the administrative leadership is responsible for putting in place the system within which I am confident of my ability to work with, and in fact offer, program level leadership. There is a trust that, over time, we have got our roles right in placing curriculum leadership in the hands of the program faculty with administrative roles identifying and negotiating the parameters within which we operate. While I would suggest that a certain level of healthy skepticism exists, the process has been participatory to an acceptable degree. The presence or absence of trust in this relationship seems to me to be related to stage and experience, and I can certainly recollect my own length of time coming to terms with this acceptance of roles. Presumably those of us with more years of experience in the same college context have successfully operated within the system, and come to terms with the existing leadership relationships. Our level of trust is enhanced by the fact that we continue to be there and to work within the system, and also because over time we have taken on more of the leadership at the program level ourselves. Our newer colleagues have had neither of these experiences thus far, and while they care about their teaching and the college, they are still determining whether their expectations of external leadership will be fulfilled. It occurs to me that an absence of communication by leaders within the program, as well as beyond, exacerbates this tension to an unnecessary degree.

Leadership at the Program Level

At a level more immediately connected to curriculum development practice, leadership within the program seems to be manifest in a variety of ways that leave openings for an array of experience and emotional response. It seems that the early experience of a faculty member includes looking to leadership at the program level to guide the newer instructor until such time as they begin to make a contribution to what the course curriculum is about, or what should be happening in the curriculum. Hannah and John both spoke of their expectation of leadership to make decisions, take action, and clarify

direction for them and their colleagues, so that choices could be made about how curriculum should be shaped through the curriculum process. There was also a strong story of expecting program decisions to be made by those in leadership roles that would position less experienced instructors to make their own contributions. This speaks to me of a need to clarify a process that in so many other ways exists in an organic, undeclared way. Who takes the lead? Leadership of an emergent or referent source appears more influential at times, as those with more experience shape the curriculum over time, sometimes with no formal authority at all. While my senior colleagues saw this as a natural progression, and indeed Diane spoke of it as an obligation of more experienced faculty, this can be frustrating, unclear, ambiguous and de-motivating to newer colleagues, as described by John and Hannah. Leadership decisions that affect the curriculum development process have the potential to increase trust amongst colleagues or levels at the college, or to create cynicism amongst those same individuals. It seemed to me that the newer colleagues had a more interventionist expectation; they wanted the program leadership to step in and state a position, or make a decision that would clarify the path to be taken by the newer colleagues and others. I remember that feeling quite vividly – being at odds with fellow instructors about what needed to be done in a particular course, and wanting the program chair to act as arbitrator. I also remember being frustrated when the person declined to do so, sending me back into the fray, to continue to negotiate with others about the course content. At this point however, I would likely be quite offended if a chair intervened to rule on course content amongst instructors with differing perspectives! My expectation is for a more participatory form of leadership, much as described by Erwin (2000). I think what we share, my newer colleagues and I, is the desire for a level playing field made possible by positive leadership, where curriculum ideas can be judged on their merits rather than who has brought the idea forward, and that there be, on this playing field, space for all of us to have a voice. Without leadership creating these parameters for ongoing curriculum conversations within a program, I'm afraid we fall victim to domination by the strongest voices – those of the most secure, likely most senior, colleagues.

Instructors as Curriculum Development Leaders

Each of my participant colleagues and I have at some level taken on, been asked to take on, or desired to take on a level of leadership in guiding the curriculum development process. While being a thread in common, the instructor as curriculum leader generated stories all along a continuum of experience.

If this program leadership does not pre-exist, the process of being without guidance in creating the curriculum can be a bewildering experience for a new instructor. The story of the new instructor who comes in to teach a pre-existing course is very different than that of the person coming into the college with the role of both instructor and course creator. In both cases, however, it seems to me the issues of leadership and expectation surface. In one case, there is an expectation that leadership will create space to develop a meaningful relationship with the curriculum in order to be an authentic, credible teacher, and in the other, to define the boundaries which indicate directions, values, and outcomes that the new curriculum can work toward, and the supports needed to allow the instructor to do this part of the job. Despite differing experiences when first introduced to college teaching, instructors might share a similar experience as they become more practiced and confident as college instructors – expectation that the leadership will clear the path to allow them, as skilled, experienced, and discipline savvy instructors, to do what they are best prepared to do, that is, to develop and teach quality courses. When expectations of leadership are met, parties are satisfied, and the curriculum development experience unfolds in a manner that satisfies the standards of both parties. When it does not, inevitably, leadership can expect to bear the brunt of criticism, and this feels to me to be true regardless of whether the leadership represents the administrative structure (the dean or CAO) as described by Erwin (2000) the program or departmental chair, the senior instructor of the curriculum, or indeed even of instructors themselves. No matter our story, our shared experience was to hold leadership at some level accountable for our ability to move the curriculum forward. Consistent with the "leadership blues" in college education described by March and Weiner (2003), our expectations bear out the idea that

> It is a fundamental reality of leadership that it reaps the rewards of public satisfaction and bears the blame for public unhappiness. It matters little whether a leader has done much to create the former or could have done much to prevent the latter. The necessity of social attribution of leader responsibility is an article of faith and an instinct of social behaviour. (p. 6)

This concern about having our professional and creative lives directed by others with less connection to the curriculum but with a leadership role (formal or not) crossed the boundaries between the stories of John, Hannah, and those of my earlier career. Even as we have assumed roles of greater leadership ourselves, we have held accountable those we look to as our leaders for our successes and failures in some way, often for not managing the context or providing the supports needed to allow our leadership to have the intended effects. As suggested by March and Weiner (2003), whether these individuals even have the power to manage that context is not necessarily fully considered.

This discussion of leadership and expectation in our experience of curriculum development invites thought about power and curriculum. While we may see leadership as a formal role in the college structure, or informal process whereby individuals assume leadership based on seniority, experience, energy or will, the idea that leadership uses power in some form is a logical consideration.

Power and the Process of Curriculum Development

This reflection on leadership and power emerged naturally time and again in my conversations with both my newer and more experienced participants. Stories of decisions made at levels above us or at our level as instructors spoke to satisfaction or dismay with the degree of power that was shared. The context was often described in detail, prompting the idea that the context was more than suitable for instructor participation in the decision making process, and that the sharing of power by leadership would result in better curriculum. There was no single best leadership style expressed,

but there was a recurrent theme that times were dramatically changing and so too should the college change, with the imperative that instructors be present in the defining of context and sharing of power. Gale and Densmore speak to this as they

> . . . make a case for educational leadership that is characterized by distinctly democratic directions and influences. We believe that democratic leaders enable the formation of social learning and culturally responsive public educational institutions, in part by enabling contextually-specific struggles to determine what is needed, and by developing a politically-informed commitment to justice for all. (2003, p. 120)

In this arena of contextually defined leadership demands, Grace (1997) "captures the present historical juncture as a choice between consumer accountability mediated by a relationship with an educational market, or a democratic accountability mediated by a relationship with the whole community of citizens" (p. 314, as cited in Gale and Densmore, 2003, p.120). In the stories told by newer colleagues, I hear frustrations directed at leadership not sufficiently geared toward the student consumers and their employment opportunities, and at their own inability to have sufficient influence to help define the curriculum so as to meet the needs of the student or employer marketplace. My more experienced colleagues reflect more of the latter view, where leadership, in this case more often embodied in their own empowerment to shape the curriculum, leans toward a more democratic concern for the overall development of the student and the public as a whole. I find this a fascinating intersection of leadership, power, and position, and the impact on curriculum development process. And while Gale and Densmore suggest that "historical and contemporary concerns for professional autonomy conflict with calls for greater community involvement in educational decision making" (2003, p. 120), my experience of the college system is that we have been very much community oriented in many instances. What is interesting though, is the form in which community involvement takes place. My colleague participants, both newer and more experienced, spoke to their connection with the community, and their desire to see students able to move into a productive role in that community after their college experience. "Each student should be prepared to be a contributing member of an educated society" was a theme that came through in many stories. In this desire, advisory committees for college

programs support us. In an example drawn from a study of business school advisory boards, Kaupins and Coco describe the roles and activities of such boards:

> . . . advisory boards typically discuss curriculum issues, ideas for new business programs, publicity, and organizational mission development. . . [they] dispense valuable advice to deans about the organizational mission, business trends, community relations, and fundraising opportunities. They help faculty by cultivating relationships with the community and by serving as curriculum advisors. . . Students benefit from a timely curriculum, refinement of individual courses, and more employment opportunities. (2002, pp. 351-352)

This description is consistent with my experience of our advisory committees, and with the stories of my colleagues in terms of their use of such committees to inform their curricula. Given this connection to the community and the democratic participation by the community in the curriculum decision process that the existence of such committees suggest, where are the tensions coming from that I hear expressed in my colleagues' stories? I might suggest two sources of concern – first, that the "communities" heard from through use of advisory boards, and individual faculty connections with their career areas are sharply focused on immediate employability and often not on the broader goal of an educated society, and second, even where the perspectives of the external community line up with the individual instructor's view of curriculum priorities, neither is sufficiently empowered by college administration or the program-specific context to act in accordance with their goals. Thus, while we appear to have open and somewhat democratic processes to inform the curriculum, our stories as instructors express our frustration in trying to create our own meaningful relationship with the curriculum with very limited power to do so.

The theme of power in curriculum leadership and decision making is addressed by Wallin, who first describes the unique dimensions of community colleges.

> They are distinguished from other institutions of higher learning by the centrality of their teaching mission. With teaching at the heart of the enterprise, faculty are the key determinants in the success of a community college. Although strong leadership on the part of the president and the board of trustees is necessary, it is not sufficient. The faculty – their training, expertise, professionalism, attitudes – set the tone and the reputation of the college. (2003, p. 317)

Wallin's work examines motivation to engage in faculty development, and identifies lower level needs for security and affiliation, and higher level needs for self-esteem, autonomy, and self actualization as they relate to college faculty. She suggests that "the higher need for autonomy is met through increased control of the work situation, having influence in the organization, participating in decisions, and having authority to use institutional resources" (2003, p. 321). Further, Wallin sees "those concepts at the top as self-renewing – feeling successful and in control allows a faculty member, for example, to try out new teaching concepts, experiment with technology, and gain new knowledge to apply in the classroom" (p. 321).

This desire for autonomy, to have the power to control our work conditions and to be empowered to make or be part of significant curriculum decisions was a clear and pervasive theme through all conversations with my participant colleagues. As newer instructors, Hannah's and John's stories were threaded with anxieties or frustrations in not being thus empowered, but generally hopeful for a positive resolution to current roadblocks thrown up in their way. Their optimism that choosing to be active and visible participants in the process of curriculum development as a way to garner this power is consistent with the stories of the more senior reflective group, whose experiences told of participation and collaborative action as the way to gain and maintain power in shaping the curriculum. I wonder if this calls into question the use of autonomy to describe the level of empowerment desired by a college instructor. Certainly, the ability to control my immediate class level decision making is a right I feel I have, and to be further empowered to participate in the decision making process which shapes the overall program is also fundamental to my sense of curriculum development and power, but this is not to convey an isolation that may be suggested by the term autonomy. This "autonomy as isolation" view can be seen in the work of Cohen and Brawer from 1987, as they described practices of faculty members in their role of shaping the curriculum:

> They want little to do with their colleagues or administrators, feeling that they above all know best how to teach the students with whom they are confronted. . . Belief in autonomy was the basis of the faculty subculture and of the informal organizations that they used to protect their work space from peer or

> administrative interference. Whether or not an instructor changed teaching patterns depended less on the availability of funds or expert assistance than it did on the degree of autonomy that had to be surrendered if the innovation was adopted. The faculty's desire to teach well is a code of ethics. Their wanting to teach independently is a norm of behaviour based on egocentrism. (p. 75)

I bring this forward as an interesting contrast to what I hear in the stories of my colleagues and can feel as I reflect on my own experience. While the isolationism seems out of place in today's dynamic educational landscape, I see vestiges of truth to this picture from a decade and a half ago. I think we still do believe, as instructors, we are best suited and uniquely situated to create curriculum and educational experiences for our students, and may be seen to demonstrate some of the egocentrism Cohen and Brawer (1987) speak of. However, in contrast, the sense of doing it alone that is conveyed in their work seems alien. The desire to work collaboratively had a powerful resonance amongst our stories – from Hannah's and John's desire to work in mentoring relationships and to bring forward what they knew and could offer as newer instructors, to my more experienced reflective participants, who place extremely high value on the collaborative efforts as told in their stories. The desire to teach well was woven into the fabric of each story, and the need to have sufficient power to do so was clearly considered. Where ideas and energy and capacity to create a strong curriculum were hindered by a lack of time or opportunity or voice – these were the stories of anger and frustration and powerlessness. Perhaps because of the history and culture of our institution, there is value placed on working together, even though at times, ironically, we seem driven to isolation by workload, location, jumbled schedules, space concerns, increasingly diverse student needs, growth and goal ambiguity – a myriad of contemporary college concerns prevent us from working in community as we would like to. The occasional expressions of powerlessness as suggested by even my most senior reflective participants were tempered by an awareness that while there was indeed power in their experience and position, this also carried significant responsibility. The desire for power was not unbridled or heedless, but rather part and parcel of growing more mature in the role of a college instructor and increasingly more responsible. The motivation was in many ways

seemingly more consistent with a need for achievement rather than a need for power; the power appears as a means to an end (the freedom to creatively work with the curriculum development process) rather than the actual possessing of power as an end in itself. I am reminded of Hannah, whose desire to see different decisions made, and to perhaps move into a more empowered role was matched by her caution and concern that the investment required by that role might completely subsume her.

Power in curriculum change is addressed by Blades in terms of the "procedures of power," referencing Foucault's claim that individuals are the "vehicles of power, not its point of application" (1980, p. 98, as cited in Blades, 1997, p. 100). I am reminded of the stories of how I wanted, as a newer college instructor, to be part of the process, or procedure, and that Hannah's and John's stories spoke of this, too. I also reflect on my own current story and that of my more senior colleagues; we who see ourselves as part of the process rather than as having power. All of us, it seems, feel powerless from time to time; however, the procedures of power to which we have access widens in scope as we become more experienced. As a new instructor, I wanted only to feel some control over the curriculum represented by my direct class experience. As I became more experienced and knowledgeable about the process of curriculum development for the program as a whole, I gained greater access to these procedures, but also became more aware of the limits imposed by larger college and external processes – budgetary, marketing, mandate imposed, etc. My experience teaches me that what we have as more experienced instructors is not more power, but greater access to the "procedures of power," the process of changing the curriculum itself. I hear a reflection of these different perspectives on power in curriculum change in my conversations with my colleague participants. Our actions with one another as instructors of all experience levels, and our choices, decisions, and conversations lead to curriculum change taking place, sometimes as we had forecast or desired, and sometimes not, but always the product of power.

One of the experiences most clearly described by John and Hannah was that of needing power, or as I now hear it, access to the process. Their need appeared to be driven by a

desire to counter the effects of differing philosophies in the curriculum, or to resist the curriculum being shaped by others' philosophy. Their personal need to be able to identify with the curriculum in order to see themselves as good instructors was highly interconnected with a need to work within their own philosophical framework in developing curriculum.

Philosophy and Curriculum Development

In meeting and speaking with my two primary participants over the course of a year, one of the patterns that emerged very early and remained consistent was the connection between tensions, concerns, and frustrations in curriculum work and a perceived difference between the educational philosophy of the participants and their respective colleagues with whom they were experiencing these frustrations. Hannah tended to express this in terms of humanist versus behaviorist philosophies amongst colleagues, and while John did not use those labels, his expression of the differences between himself and others in working with curriculum development reflected a similar divide. Further discussion and reflection with my more experienced colleagues identified that one participant in a more senior role actively sought to recruit newer people who would fit with an existing philosophy in the program, and in another case, a participant commented that their profession required and drew those with a particular philosophical orientation, which tended to harmonize the philosophical fit among colleagues. What appears at odds to me in these experiences with curriculum and philosophy is the disinclination to speak directly about philosophy and education amongst the faculty members and their colleagues. Yet, as expressed by Petress, it clearly informs what we choose to do:

> a teaching philosophy can and does affect the teaching-learning process; that is, it conceptualizes, frames and focuses pedagogical activity . . . A teaching philosophy is not a mere sound bite or tag line that announces either a profound statement of a glitzy attention getter; rather it is a composite of assumptions, goals, choices, attitudes and values that coalesce to form a way of seeing one's task and offering guidance in performing the teaching duty. (2003, pp. 128 - 129)

While philosophy is clearly seen as a driving force in shaping and renewing curriculum, in my experience there is no apparent investment in dialogue to clear the path for curriculum to flow out of a shared philosophy. This disinclination to raise philosophy to a more visible level amongst faculty is mirrored in the comments of Petress in his consideration of how educational philosophy guides pedagogical process.

> The term "philosophy" frequently conjures visions of abstraction, theory, and/or impracticality. Many classroom teachers at all educational levels claim they really have no "philosophy of education" or that their philosophy is very abstract and not consciously thought about very frequently. (2003, p. 128)

In his discussion of philosophical considerations in adult education, Selman quotes Blakely as stating "we can – and usually do – refrain from asking philosophical questions, but we cannot avoid acting according to philosophical assumptions" (2001, p. 45). Given the primacy of philosophy in making our curriculum choices, the desire to create a meaningful relationship with the curriculum demands that we feel some sense of fit between our own philosophy of education and that which seems to underlie the curriculum we teach, or with the other faculty members with whom we negotiate the curriculum in our courses and programs. As expressed by Selman, "presumably none of us would like to have our professional practice based on ideas that are in fundamental conflict with other of our deeply held beliefs about reality, human nature and so on" (2001, p. 56). Yet this seems to continue to be a troublesome element for me and my colleagues. Our experience leads us to understand both openly and intuitively when we are experiencing philosophical friction, but we do not have or create the outlets to articulate a personal educational philosophy, or to discuss and commit to a shared philosophy. We tend to operate on assumptions about what is right, or good, or important in the curriculum we work with, and also assumptions that having the right background to teach will lead us to making the right curriculum choices and teaching the right things. Selman proposes, however, that we bring these assumptions to light, and make more conscious choices regarding our philosophy in practice:

> Given that our assumptions may be a result of all sorts of accidents of upbringing and experience, and that they may be based on little evidence or ill-founded inference or may even be in contradiction with one another, some questioning of

> them is in order. In fact, it may be argued that relatively self-conscious reflection on one's fundamental beliefs and values is part of what makes an individual more than a simple product of environmental pressures, part of what accounts for a person's ability to be autonomous or self-determining. (2001, p. 44)

In earlier discussion I noted the desire for empowerment in curriculum development emanating from my experience and that of others. This ability to choose what and how we teach with some level of autonomy, and yet in community with others raises important questions about how we determine what is right for ourselves while agreeing on what is right for everyone who teaches a particular course or engages in a given curricular area. This cannot be done through unquestioned acceptance of assumed "right" or "good" curriculum choices. The sense of moving away from assumptions to conscious questioning is captured for me by Foucault (1988) who sees philosophy

> . . . not as a way of reflecting on what is true and what is false, as on our relationship to truth. The movement by which, not without effort and uncertainty, dreams and illusions, one detaches oneself from what is accepted as true and seeks other rules. That is philosophy . . . it is a way of interrogating ourselves; if this is the relationship that we have with truth, how we must behave. (as cited in Marsh, Richards & Smith, 2001, p. 394)

Rather than assuming what is true, we need to interrogate ourselves, to seek what is true or to define our relationship with truth in order to continually unfold the complexity our curriculum holds, and to do so in community. For very pragmatic reasons, we are asked to ensure levels of quality and consistency amongst various offerings of courses, and so would be wise to open this conversation, but also because current events on the college landscape require a rethinking of our educational goals. For the first time in my experience, the college has stated a need to articulate a college statement of educational philosophy; this in order to seek accreditation as part of becoming a degree granting institution. This external stimulus has generated activity around the idea of educational philosophy, and the conversations have been an interesting example of how the diversity of the college leads to a communal statement that is generic in the extreme. It expresses views about education that very few could object to or not fit within. I'm not sure of its value as something that will open conversations amongst colleagues within a program

and about a particular course at the level, my experience suggests, where philosophy shapes our daily lives as college instructors.

At the same time, the basis of our college community – the level and nature of programming, is dynamically shifting, so it would seem that the need to be clear and conscious, and to make deliberate decisions about our curriculum rather than operate at a level of assumption has never been more present or more important. The experience of my colleagues was both implicitly and explicitly expressed as a struggle between behaviorist and humanist based philosophies. As this might be seen as parallel to the shifting nature of college education, from training for employment to a more liberal arts orientation, it appears to be both timely and relevant to reflect on an individual level of philosophy, and how we move from this set of beliefs, values, and assumptions into the more public realm of developing curriculum for college students. Petress (2003) makes an argument for starting with a personal statement of teaching philosophy:

> A clearly articulated instructional philosophy signals an individual's dedication, focus, thoughtfulness, and organization of thought and action. A teacher without a philosophy is in danger of getting lost, of wandering without focus, and unsure of what aims are being sought. (p. 135)

In addition to describing general reasons for engaging in philosophical awareness through challenging our assumptions, Selman also identifies that

> . . . educators have particular reasons to reflect on their views. Insofar as learning implies change, educators are involved in the activity of changing people, or at least of helping people change themselves. This carries with it certain responsibilities – among them responsibility to have examined the beliefs and values that may be conveyed through their words and actions. Further, educators are constantly faced with the task of trying to understand how other people make sense of whatever is being studied. This task is obviously obstructed if educators are not aware of their own basic assumptions, which make certain conclusions seem obvious to them, but which may not be shared but others. (2001, p. 45)

Engaging in these conversations of curriculum and philosophy, and being open about assumptions, values and beliefs at a level previously not experienced is both made possible and critically important because of the changing environment and mandate of

colleges that my colleagues and I are experiencing. In reflecting on Selman's observations above, the complexity of the conversation is magnified, as we need to address how we may also meet student needs and desired outcomes in a changing environment. While it has not been my intention to advocate a particular philosophical orientation, it is apparent that the articulation of the philosophical underpinnings that inform curriculum development individually, and create tension collectively, would speak to the frustrations and tension that are reflected in my own experience and that of my colleagues. However, the will to engage in these difficult and perhaps contentious issues can only come out of our desire and obligation to invest in an institution that we believe we have a future with. The notion of commitment arises in this contention.

Commitment and College Instructors

To take up the challenge of changing and shaping the curriculum requires some fortitude, given the tensions and pressures of college life generally, and particularly those experienced while working within the professional development, leadership, power, and philosophy relationships of the college community described earlier. That we choose to do so suggests some interesting possibilities about the concept of commitment and curriculum development.

There is a body of literature devoted to the issue of commitment to teaching in higher education, and studies of other variables out of which commitment has been a finding. Some portion of this examines the level of commitment faculty feel to their role, their motivation, their satisfaction and commitment, and the connection between tenure and commitment or length of service and commitment. Each of these ideas about the instructor's level of commitment in turn shapes engagement with various dimensions of the instructor role, including curriculum development. If, as considered above, curriculum development includes some level of professional development, engagement with leadership, use of and access to power, and negotiation of personal and program

philosophy, discussion of the circumstances under which instructors are willing to make the commitment to carry out this work is necessary.

The circumstances which appear to influence this choice to commit are, in my experience, the nature of the instructor's appointment and their relative experience with the college. The word "commitment" in the literature is generally used with respect to the individual's relationship to the college, but not vice versa. Certainly, there has been attention in the literature to the increased use of part-time faculty in college education across North America, but not typically with reference to any increased level of commitment to creating more full-time positions, or to providing more secure commitment to part-time faculty. It seems to be a given that the use of part-time faculty will increase, as noted by Valadez and Anthony (2001):

> This trend in hiring part-time faculty members is likely to continue, for several reasons: (a) increases in instruction related costs relative to revenues; (b) efforts by academic administrators to achieve staffing flexibility; (c) the number of individuals with advanced degrees who have been unable to obtain teaching positions; and (d) the growth of community colleges, which traditionally have employed large percentages of part-time faculty members. (p. 98, citing US National Center for Education statistics, 2000)

This trend was noted in 1998 by Pisani and Stott, and given the economic hardships that higher education is currently facing, it seems highly unlikely that institutions will significantly reduce the utilization of temporarily assigned part-time faculty (p. 121).

Despite the accepted financial benefits of employing faculty on non-permanent appointments, Pisani and Stott, as well as others, note concerns about commitment from these part-time, temporary employees:

> Unfortunately, the utilization of part-time faculty has not been embraced by all members of the academic community . . . the controversy surrounding the utilization of part-time faculty stems, in part, from the national concern about the overall quality of teaching occurring in postsecondary education. Part-time faculty have been particularly lambasted since the issuance of several prominent reports in the mid- to late 1980s. One such report, *Involvement in Learning* (National Institute of Education, 1984), cites the inability of part-time faculty to make a primary commitment to the college or university and asserts that such a

> commitment underlies the ability of faculty to create conditions for effective learning. (1998, p. 121)

Valadez and Anthony's work on job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty (2001) used data collected across the United States. They note that while there is some anecdotal evidence regarding the part-time role, "as for part-time faculty members' job satisfaction and commitment, however, there is virtually no literature" (p. 99). Their research

> is not intended to minimize part-time faculty members' concerns regarding fair and just compensation for their work; instead, it is intended to explore issues related to their roles as part-time faculty members. For example, are part-time faculty members satisfied with their decision to enter academic life? How committed are they to pursuing their academic careers? Do part-time faculty members enjoy what they do? (p. 98)

Having concluded that there was not a great deal in the literature, and that what was thought about part-time faculty is largely anecdotal, Valadez and Anthony's discussion of their results did note that

> In some respects, these findings lend credence to the popular notions regarding part-time faculty members. As expected, part-time faculty members have indicated that salary, benefits, and job security are important issues. These issues are important enough that these individuals would consider leaving their current positions in pursuit of higher salaries, benefits, and job security . . . On the other hand, previous studies have not paid attention to the underlying motivations for these individuals to remain in their careers. It is apparent that two-year college part-time faculty members are driven by their desire to teach and that they would repeat their experiences to again follow their career choice. This choice, however, is tempered by their desire for higher salaries, benefits, and job security. (p. 106)

These findings tend to support what Pisani and Stott had described earlier; that

> Paradoxically, very little empirical evidence has been amassed to substantiate the contention that part-time faculty have a negative impact on educational quality. Gappa and Leslie (1993) found that part-time faculty vary widely in their teaching performance, but no evidence exists to suggest that they are at the root of any systemic decline in the quality of higher education. They further found that part-time faculty were, for the most part, qualified for their teaching assignments, highly committed, and conscientious about doing their jobs. (1998, p. 122)

Having identified a context where there is no evidence of an increased commitment by colleges to move toward more full-time rather than part-time appointments, but where there is commitment and desire for greater commitment by non-permanent faculty toward college teaching, where does our experience fit in? Throughout this study, my colleagues described experiences where the level of commitment required to engage in curriculum development was a point of discussion. Our experiences reflected the literature's findings that we value engagement with our teaching and developmental work, and want to invest in developing a meaningful relationship with the curriculum because of our commitment to teaching. However, there is a practical limit experienced, and this level or limit of commitment was threaded through our experience. For my newer colleagues, this level of investment was strongly related to their trust that their commitment would be reciprocated. While each of my participants was a full-time instructor, my two primary participants, John and Hannah were not permanent employees, and Sacha, one of my more experienced reflective participants, spent many years as a part-time and term-specific faculty member prior to being given a permanent appointment. While this full-time, non-permanent employment status has greater benefits than part-time employment, not least of which is higher pay based on a full teaching load, in some ways the tenuous nature of their positions may be seen to be greater than that of part-time term employees, who have often had to maintain other sources of income to get a living wage and who have maintained other contacts and possibilities and opportunities outside the college. The full-time non-permanent nature of John's and Hannah's positions has demanded greater commitment and focus from each without the benefit of job security. Hence, their level of optimism and willingness to commit to curriculum development activities in a meaningful way correlated with their anticipation of a future with the college, or with their vision of what that future might look like. This is not to suggest that they were unprepared to work with curriculum development at a meaningful level; their stories indicate they did make a significant investment and contribution to the development of curriculum in their area. So why did they make this unreciprocated commitment? Valadez and Anthony write:

> One conclusion of this study is that part-time faculty members are pursuing the profession that gives them the opportunity to do what it is they enjoy, that is, teach. This conclusion is supported by the finding that part-time faculty members would leave their current positions for increased opportunities to teach or for better instructional facilities. This shows that part-time faculty members place a high value on teaching and institutional efforts (e.g., good instructional facilities) to support their teaching. (2001, p. 107)

Nor were their stories laden with expectation of instant gratification for their effort – they were deeply connected to their teaching and found rewards in working creatively to enhance and improve their relationship with the curriculum and their ability to shape meaningful educational experiences for others. There was, however, a note of uncertainty in the stories when taken as a whole – a sense of a moving forward to seize opportunity to have something new happen in the curriculum alternating with a pulling back, a thoughtful, protective quality in their stories of committing to future work with curriculum. This marked a distinct difference in the stories of newer versus more experienced colleagues. While Hannah's and John's stories swing between enthusiastic energy and thoughtful doubt, my more experienced colleagues' reflections maintained a more constant pitch, with quiet confidence and positive energy about investing in the curriculum. They have both the security of permanent positions, and the insight gathered from experience about where their energy can make the most meaningful difference in the curriculum. As one colleague expressed it, "At this stage of my teaching career, I now know which windmills to tilt at." Yet they were also aware of the propensity of the college to take advantage of the commitment demonstrated by newer colleagues in less secure positions as they made valuable contributions to college curriculum development activities with no certain reciprocal commitment from the college in future. In their conclusions, Valadez and Anthony speak to the inequity suggested by our experiences:

> There is a consistency regarding part-time faculty members' commitment to their career choice. Even so, this study shows that institutions must focus attention on the exploitative conditions in which many part-time faculty members work. From a policy perspective, given that part-time faculty members will continue to play an important instructional role in community colleges, it is critical that community colleges attend to these issues. (2001, p. 107)

This discussion is not intended to plead the case of the part-time faculty member so much as to discuss the issue of commitment regarding instructors with non-permanent roles or less than secure futures with their institution, and to suggest that this has considerable impact on the curriculum development work that may or may not be seen to be part of a non-permanent teaching role. My experience and that of many of my colleagues has been to take a leap of faith – to invest in work which may go well beyond the contractual obligation of a part-time teaching role, but which brings both the joy of teaching with a more personally meaningful curriculum, and the benefit of demonstrating a commitment which the college may choose to reciprocate. Along the way, some wavering of the trust implicit in this action seems quite normal and understandable, and is not, in my mind, the same as actually withdrawing the commitment and effort. Only in John's story did the withdrawal of effort take place, and this followed a formal reduction of the status of his appointment by the college. In effect, his reduced level of commitment to curriculum development work happened only after the opportunity to make the commitment, and work with the courses and curriculum of interest, was actually withdrawn by the college due to budgetary restrictions. In Hannah's story, the belief that job security would be forthcoming was fairly clear, but the movements toward and pulling back from curriculum activity stemmed from an early career questioning of whether the level of commitment could reasonably be sustained. Her sense that the immersion could be overwhelming, beyond all reasonable capability again reinforces the notion that there is a perceived imbalance in the commitment levels expected versus those offered in return.

Achieving a manageable, rewarding and ongoing level of commitment to curriculum development as part of a teaching role is something that takes time to negotiate even when a more certain future with the college exists. While the confidence and sustained energy level of my more experienced, and admittedly successful, colleagues suggests it is possible, I think we continue to struggle to find that delicate balance between what is achievable in working with curriculum in order to feel good about what we teach, and where we draw the line, knowing our own capacity.

Concluding the Reflections on Themes and Literature

How do we experience the challenge and engagement of curriculum development work? Why do we take up that challenge? As previously discussed, curriculum development requires and is actively intertwined with instructor learning and faculty development activity. Further, leadership is a central concept in that leadership at each level of the college has a role to play in supporting and providing opportunities for instructors to take part in developing curriculum. Instructors themselves step forward to provide academic leadership to the process for others and for the development of their own curriculum and teaching efforts. Some level of power and authority is needed to carry out the roles and tasks, and instructors must be sufficiently empowered for their curriculum development efforts to have the positive benefits they intend. Throughout this level of engagement with curriculum and college programs, the personal philosophy of the instructors involved, as well as the expressed or enacted philosophy of the program, create tension in arriving at a relationship with the curriculum that is meaningful and authentic for the individual instructor, meets the wider communal needs of the program and the college, and is ultimately of value to the students. Both the institution and the instructor make a significant and enduring commitment; the institution provides opportunity and rewards and the faculty member invests energy and expertise to take up the challenge to work with curriculum development.

Tensions exist throughout the experience of curriculum development in an instructor's life. While an instructor's confidence in their abilities and security in their role may increase over time, and allow a more comfortable reconciliation of these tensions, they do not disappear, nor are they ever fully resolved. Living the experience of a college instructor, and the role of curriculum developer, is to constantly re-negotiate issues of power and leadership, philosophy and fit, commitment, and professional development. This can be a joyful, rewarding and invigorating experience, but equally it can be stressful, frustrating, heartbreaking and ultimately defeating. Instructors sometimes choose not to continue to seek a way to live with these tensions, and make choices that

see them move, either abruptly, or slowly over time, to other environments in the hope of meeting personal and professional needs in a different setting.

As we come to know more about the experience of the college instructor and curriculum development, what might we take from this understanding? Can this be of help in supporting instructors in this complex and demanding dimension of their role? Some implications and suggestions will be considered in the final chapter of this inquiry.

CHAPTER VI: REFLECTIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The emergent themes of faculty development, leadership, power, philosophy and commitment and their interrelationship with curriculum development in the lives of college instructors are presented and explored in the preceding chapter in a linear format. There are reasons of logic and format for this, but the interrelationship between the themes is strong and complex, and far more holistic that can be presented in linear written form. Teasing out the themes from complex stories of personal lived experience has the benefit of casting light on each theme and exploring the experiences in light of literature in the field. Possibilities for connections are suggested between the experiences shared, the literature re-viewed, and the stories of others untold. On the other hand, and unfortunately, this linear presentation has the effect of locating these themes in isolation, as if by considering how they shape the instructor's experience of curriculum development we are able to more completely reflect on that experience, while paradoxically, the wholeness of the experience recedes. Having made the choice to work in this manner, and benefited from the order and clarity it may offer, some re-weaving of the themes is in order to arrive at a point of closure.

Reflection on Thematic Integration

Faculty development is a thread woven through this work from its earliest stages. Most often unprompted, my colleagues would identify faculty development activity as needed or beneficial or valued in any number of curriculum conversations. Perhaps because the culture of our organization is deeply rooted in the teaching-learning activity, and because we as instructors so value learning that we have made it central to our careers as instructors, we have a natural tendency to approach new or difficult or challenging situations with an almost instinctive response – what needs to be learned to do this? What do others know? How can I learn what I need to know to adapt to new teaching-learning strategies? Faculty development appears to serve as a foundational concept to the other themes presented; the ability to manage the tensions inherent in dealing with leadership,

power, philosophy and commitment is enhanced through the communal learning so often experienced and valued in faculty development activity.

Leaders at all levels have a role in creating the development opportunities both at a college wide level and at the program level as well, and for ensuring development opportunities appropriate to various stages of the instructor's career. Another interconnection presents itself as newer instructors transition from the stage where they look to leaders to fully guide the curriculum development decision making to one where they begin to take on the role of leader in the curriculum process themselves, and where leadership development processes might better support faculty members in accepting and fulfilling this new and potentially more empowered dimension of their instructor role. Instructors seek power to be able to control their own environment, the conditions they work in, and most significantly, the curriculum they teach. Leadership is required to negotiate the uncertainties that reduce the efforts of the instructor to make positive change in the curriculum, or to work collaboratively, and to support the learning, through formalized faculty development efforts or otherwise, that enhance these efforts.

As experienced by my newer colleague participants, and by me in my earlier stages of teaching, there appears to be an undeclared tug-o-war between differing views of what is important, what should be taught and how, and what the curriculum needs to be. We look to the leaders of our institution, and of the programs specifically, to both speak and act in such a way as to demonstrate agreement between philosophy and curriculum, and to provide opportunities for faculty to clearly frame their own philosophical orientations, and to consider implications of it in light of program and collegial philosophies, and for curriculum development.

The level of commitment on both sides of the equation – the college's commitment to the instructor and the instructor's commitment to the college – clearly impacts on the instructor's perspective on curriculum development as part of his or her role, motivation, and energy to pursue development ideas. Leaders make managerial decisions that

profoundly influence the most basic elements of commitment such as term of employment, but can also build commitment through positive academic leadership in curriculum development. Participation in larger college activities, notably faculty development activities, may also build commitment to the college community amongst newer and/or non-permanent faculty.

Each of these stated interconnections barely scratches the surface of the complex and deeply embedded influences that shape the lived experience of college instructors and their work with curriculum development. The breadth and depth of the stories shared, and the powerful nature of the themes which came to the foreground suggest many possibilities for how we might enrich the landscape on which our future professional lives as college instructors will be lived, and offer opportunities for us to create profound and meaningful change in the curriculum and thereby our students' lives.

Personal Reflections - Looking Backward, Moving Forward

"And if the stories of my life elicit stories of yours, the writing will have done its work."
Timothy Findley (1930 – 2002) Canadian author, actor, playwright

When I reflect on my experience of this narrative inquiry, I wonder how to express what I have learned, and how this has changed my professional and personal life. Because truly it has. I first began to explore narrative inquiry as a research approach in the fall of 1999 in a research course in my doctoral program. As I read more and talked to others in the academic environment, I started to see the possibilities open for me to explore something I was fascinated with and deeply committed to – curriculum development as a college instructor – with a more personally enriched experience of research. While I had enjoyed the sense of accomplishment the research on educational consortia in my master's degree had entailed, and the benefits of having completed the credential, I recalled feeling largely disconnected from the process, a sense further reinforced when I no longer worked with consortia shortly thereafter. In 2001, I choose to pursue my interest in

curriculum development through the window of narrative inquiry – the result of which you have before you. I expected it to feel different from my earlier research experience, and it does, but in oh, so many unforetold ways!

I was challenged from the beginning to write in a way that makes me present in the inquiry. I found it difficult to let go of the habits, including a passion for brevity and an unrelentingly passive voice, of working and communicating in a business community and in management education for so many years. To be present in the experience and in the writing of the experience were, and continue to be, the source of some discomfort, but also of many more opportunities to learn. In order to be present and to write myself in, I have had to declare myself, something only faintly possible after much internal searching and testing of ideas. Such is learning!

At times I longed for the opportunity to be simply a student myself; to invest completely and totally in the inquiry to the exclusion of my other life roles, and most particularly that of college instructor. And yet, this would have completely changed the experience, and robbed it of much of the richness inherent in living in a college community, and feeling many of the same pressures as my participant colleagues, through the time of our inquiry together. In short, I could not have learned nearly as much as I have if I had held myself apart from the inquiry space, a bystander at the sidelines of the experience.

As a learning outcome of this inquiry, I have a deepened awareness and commitment to my sense of curriculum as experience, and a far better understanding of my need, as an instructor, to have a significant and meaningful relationship with the curriculum. My learning about college curriculum development through this inquiry has clarified why I see curriculum development as a relational rather than mechanical process; I believe no matter how well designed and organized the materials I work with are, the absence of a meaningful relationship with what I teach will render me a less authentic instructor, and intimately diminish the quality of the student learning experience. Conversely, my commitment to investing in this relationship, to clarifying the philosophical position from

which I move forward, to bringing what I know and can learn, to working collaboratively with others at all stages of their careers, and to using the power I have to influence and shape the student's experience is the most significant contribution I can make to excellence in college curriculum. I find myself working much more consciously toward this end for my own sense of development as an instructor, and with an increased sense of obligation to create space, and to support opportunities for others to do so for themselves also.

On a personal, practical level, I have learned that concerns I might formerly have described as management issues are, in fact, curriculum issues. My experience in teaching management courses over a number of years, for example, would have led me to describe the college's hiring of term instructors as a labour cost issue, while my personal-political perspective would have decried this lack of commitment on the college's part as counter to my political views. While I continue to be aware of these perspectives, they have receded to the background while the curriculum implications of status, commitment, and leadership have come to the foreground for me. I cannot, having learned what I have through this process, push the curriculum implications into the background when considering these issues, nor would I for a minute want to. In fact, I feel far more likely to meet with success in seeing enhanced commitment to continuing faculty appointments, to faculty development, and to leadership support if the argument can be made that these are educational quality concerns based on how students experience the curriculum.

Another dimension of this personal learning and shifting of perspective again moves from a view shaped by teaching management to a curriculum view, in this case as I look at the significance of full versus part-time faculty and seniority and power. From a management perspective, I would perhaps have seen these concerns as natural and perhaps inevitable outcomes of a hierarchical organization that is increasingly bureaucratic as it becomes larger and older. While I like to think that I have always been a collaborative person, and personally valued working with others towards common goals, I now recognize how my position of power as a long serving, full-time instructor may impede others with less

secure appointment status or at earlier stages of their careers from developing the relationship they need with the curriculum. I have learned that it isn't enough to simply enjoy working collaboratively; I need to consciously make space for others to step into their own place of confidence with their curriculum. Perhaps there is a certain irony that, just as I have an enhanced commitment and passion for college curriculum development, I need to look at my own practice and step aside at times when I may hinder other instructors from their own relationship with the curriculum. As I do so, I wish to remain ready to lend support where appropriate, and to know and see which – stepping back or moving forward – is more useful in the particular context. Remaining sensitive to this, and moving easily and naturally forward and back, is a considerable challenge that I am taking on as a result of my learning through this inquiry process.

I find, as a consequence of this inquiry, that I have both a continued desire to work with others towards enhanced curriculum development, and a fierce resentment of those who would diminish my ability to invest in such a relationship with curriculum. One such experience occurred as I worked through the latter stages of writing, and serves as a flashpoint of learning for me.

> *I had been feeling well prepared as I approached the beginning of a new term, with a familiar and favourite course on my teaching schedule. Less than 24 hours prior to the first class, I was shocked to learn, almost incidentally, that the course coordinator had changed the required text, and had further failed to communicate that decision to a number of instructors who taught the course, including me. Compounding this was the further realization that there were no texts available from our storeroom for instructors. I stormed over to the course coordinator's office, stated 'I need a book – now!' and took the coordinator's copy of the required book off the desk. Barely able to control my voice, I stated that the process and decision were unacceptable to me as an instructor of the course, but that I was so angry that I did not wish to discuss it at the present moment. With that, I left.*

Despite having worked at the college for over 20 years when this happened, I was stunned by feelings of powerlessness and frustration, and, no doubt, not at my most diplomatic in my response. I was, however, somewhat wiser in terms of what I was actually angry about. Prior to this inquiry, I might have worried that my status had been offended by the lack of invitation to participate; I now realize that this was more than just a bruised ego. This decision, and the further lack of communication on the coordinator's part, profoundly affected my sense of relationship with the curriculum in the course throughout the entire term. Having invested considerable energy in creating a meaningful relationship to the course curriculum over the years, I was now off-balance on a daily basis, scrambling to hear this new author's voice, to understand its relationship to where I was coming from, to plan ways that my intentions and hopes for the student experience could be enacted. It seemed a graphic, if very unfortunate, example of what good curriculum development ought not to be. I didn't want to feel that way as I taught, and I don't want others to have to experience teaching that way either.

I am aware of being changed by this inquiry at an inward, personal level, and have felt 'aha' moments throughout my college activities, in moments of frustration, but also, more frequently, at times of positive connection with a new understanding of curriculum development. At its most basic, I think I have become more reflective, or perhaps have found a more mature balance between action and reflection. In part, I would ascribe this to becoming a better listener through this inquiry; I find myself listening to my colleagues' language as they speak of curriculum, and seeking to understand their sense of relationship with curriculum, their hopes and aspirations and intentions.

Some of the learning has been of benefit at a more outward place, as our college has significantly raised opportunities for conversation about curriculum development by venturing down the path to degree granting status. I am part of the work group creating the proposal for degrees to be offered by our school – perhaps the most significant process of curriculum development since the college's inception – and each moment of my participation is shaped and informed by my work in this inquiry.

I have startling moments of realization when what I have been hearing from a participant or writing about myself intersects and is reinforced or challenged by our work at the committee table. I can recall at least two separate moments of terror when what I had been mulling over and deeply reflecting on for the inquiry was succinctly stated amongst the membership of the committee . . . only to realize on both occasions that the people at the table did not see the import of what they had just offered, or its relationship to the larger curriculum development picture. At such times, I have been able to make contributions to the committee that others have expressed real gratitude for, and I am quite aware that I would not have been in a position to add that dimension to our shared experience prior to my work with this inquiry. This, despite the fact that others would likely have seen me as a credible committee member based on my longstanding and visibly demonstrated interest in curriculum development.

I am deeply grateful to my research experience for providing the ability and opportunity to be able to make a contribution to this community I care so much about, and for the clarity to see the connections between these profoundly meaningful aspects of my life.

In moving towards implications and suggestions, and thereby to closure, I take a final look backward, and reflect that there are challenges and things I wonder about that I will take with me when I move beyond this inquiry. The study is never over, just as my interest in, and commitment to, college curriculum development are boundless. As this inquiry ends and I exit this particular study space, I look ahead to the leadership of curriculum development shared among colleagues, and to moving forward into our future educational lives together.

Implications and Suggestions for Further Consideration

Before I offer suggestions for further consideration, I will state a belief that my experience in this study has reinforced. College instructors care deeply about students,

teaching, and the discipline background they come from. Each conversation, every tension described in story, and all of my reading of the literature in the field align with this statement, and any implication or suggestion regarding how we might better support curriculum development has as its starting place my view that instructors care deeply and want to do a good job. In order to make the most of this, and to release the wellspring of energy that it contains, I believe we need to consider the structures, processes, expectations and environment that support the natural inclination of instructors to be good teachers.

Instructors as Curriculum Developers

I was aware from the outset of this inquiry that instructors do not always see themselves in a curriculum development role, despite undertaking many of the activities that I would describe as curriculum development. The most apparent implication of this lack of identification with curriculum development is that the potential inherent in the role remains unclear or not fully understood, and the need for support to create a meaningful relationship with the curriculum remains unvoiced.

As one outcome of the inquiry I have come to feel that we need to articulate and value what instructors do that is curriculum development. The community, the college leadership, the students, and the individual instructor all stand to benefit when an instructor takes on this dimension of the instructor role, regardless of the status of their appointment. Part-time instructors who teach only one class have every right to expect to feel a strong connection to what they are teaching, just as the students should expect a fully invested individual when they meet their instructor. My reflection on my colleagues' experiences, and on my own story, leads me to suggest that even if the curriculum pre-exists and the part-time instructor's role takes place primarily in the classroom, the value of their contribution is enhanced, as is their commitment and motivation, when an instructor finds ways to "make it their own." Full-time and continuing instructors may have different opportunities and obligations, but regardless of employment status, we need to find ways to open possibilities that meet instructors'

personal need for empowerment in shaping their curricula, are suited to the time and commitment they might reasonably be expected to make, and still maintain the consistency and objectives necessary to meet the educational goals. As an entry into this discussion, a clear statement of the curriculum development dimension as integral to the college instructor role would seem a logical and significant starting point.

Continuous Learning

My conversations with my colleagues reinforced my view that people who work in education tend to seek out learning opportunities themselves. My definition of curriculum suggests that students learn from everything they experience in their college environment, including all that each instructor brings to the experience. Instructors can make an extra-ordinary and ongoing contribution to the college by continually learning on a whole range of levels and on a variety of topics, and by bringing these experiences and their learning into the curriculum development process. Perhaps more significantly, it seems important and valuable to clearly identify and view these learning opportunities and pursuits by the instructor as an integral element of ongoing curriculum development for their courses or program, rather than simply an outcome of the positive attitude to lifelong learning one might expect of a college instructor. From their initial entry into the college, and throughout their teaching career, everything learned by an instructor develops the whole person, which in turn informs the curriculum. This suggests the need for a balance between, but not limited to, orientation to both the larger college community and the immediate program in which their teaching is situated, continued learning in their discipline field, learning about teaching and learning, about their own educational philosophy and that of their program and of the college, about classroom practice, and student needs, learning about use of technologies to support teaching, about structures and supports available to them, about changes to what they have learned before, and about their role and future possibilities in the college. It seems increasingly evident to me that those with leadership roles can play a profoundly positive role through providing information about, access to, and tangible reinforcement of the value of faculty development activities. Creating a visible and durable connection between the value of

these activities, and the expectations of how they play a significant role in ongoing curriculum development, is a singular opportunity for demonstrating meaningful leadership where the connection between instructor learning and curriculum development is understood and appreciated by the instructor, and supported by the leader.

Power to Effect Change in the Curriculum

Throughout the inquiry, I have been reminded that curriculum development suggests change. With this in mind, one implication is that instructors need power to carry out the curriculum development role and to effect meaningful change in their course curricula. With this power comes significant responsibility, but without it, the curriculum remains dormant or sterile, an inanimate object resistant to the instructor's best intentions. In my experience and throughout this inquiry, I have listened as my participants re-storied how they willingly took on the responsibility to teach, yet felt powerless to effect the change in the curriculum that would both add new dimensions of quality and allow them to create a more meaningful relationship with what they taught. This may particularly resonate with instructors at an early stage of their teaching career when they feel relatively little power in a new surrounding. This feeling of powerlessness may continue, however, with power held at higher levels or outside the program inhibiting curriculum development efforts for more experienced instructors. Beyond empowering instructors in their own sphere of influence, it seems to me desirable that the procedures of power that affect curriculum development be clarified, so that the limits of power which are inevitable and necessary are understood, and the energy within the scope of influence can be more meaningfully directed to positive curriculum outcomes for both instructors and students.

The Expression of Philosophical Orientations

I believe that the degree to which the instructor's personal philosophical orientation toward teaching and learning is congruent with curriculum, program, or college philosophy influences the level of comfort or tension they feel in investing in the curriculum development dimension of their role. This suggests to me that even where

there is a sense of fit between instructor and the outward manifestations of philosophy in their environment, the clear expression of philosophical orientation by the instructor and the college could become more clearly and meaningfully part of the curriculum available to students and other interested parties. However, tensions experienced by instructors based on their perceived lack of philosophical congruence with the curriculum or others in their environment, or with the college orientation as a whole, have the potential to hinder instructors' ability to work creatively and to confidently add meaning to the established course curriculum. As an outcome of this inquiry, I believe it would be desirable to create openings for deliberate dialogue – to be more open to discussing what we believe, what we value, what we hold to be true in the context of college teaching and learning, and to interrogate ourselves and the results of our curriculum development efforts in light of how this might, in turn, reflect back on the college experience for others in our environment.

Reciprocal Commitment

The implications of role commitment in shaping curriculum development have emerged as significant and complex, and I think it would be unrealistic and unfruitful to simply call for a commitment to offering full-time positions to instructors who wish to make college teaching their career. While the status of employment does have a bearing on the willingness to commit to efforts sometimes viewed as beyond the scope of a teaching appointment, the implications of this theme suggest to me a need for clarity of expectations about commitment from both sides – from the college and from the instructor. When viewed through a negative lens, the relative absence of this dialogue leaves open possibilities for instructors to demonstrate a dramatic range of investment, or lack thereof, in the curriculum development dimension of their role, and for the college to take advantage of significant investment by individual term instructors with no return commitment by the college. Perhaps a more common but unfortunate occurrence is the ongoing uncertainty and tension felt by instructors as they try to anticipate the risks and rewards of their curriculum development efforts being invested in courses and programs with which they may or may not have a long term relationship. Furthermore, there is a

potential concern regarding their relationship with, or pressure to agree with curriculum decisions made by, colleagues who have influence over decisions regarding continuing employment.

Rather than arguing that we need greater commitment on both sides, I would suggest we create the opportunities for instructors to better understand the implications of their own commitment to investing in enhanced curriculum development activity, and for instructors, colleagues and leaders to identify and appreciate the reciprocal rewards for commitment that may gained from sources other than employment status; opportunities and access to ongoing faculty development support, empowerment in shaping the curriculum, thoughtful consideration and opportunities for dialogue on philosophical orientation, and opportunity to be guided by and share in participatory and supportive leadership.

Participatory Academic Leadership

In leaving leadership and its implications to the last, I am making a conscious decision to vest the power in leadership to undertake the suggestions made above and others as well. This is not something I see as the work of others so much as a communal, shared responsibility, and as such, I will locate myself in the frame of reference. As I suggested earlier in this inquiry, we are the leadership; meaning we, the faculty, have the role of leading the academic endeavours of the college, and the curriculum development realm therein. Throughout the writing of this text, I have used the terms "leaders" and "leadership" without qualifying the actual positions I mean to be considered. In part this has been to signify that various levels and roles in leadership play a part in achieving the educational goals to which we aspire. This implies that we cannot always look to others to make our efforts more valued, better accepted, more thoughtfully considered. At this point, I will consider the implications of particular leadership roles in light of their impact on curriculum development.

Higher levels of college leadership, by which I mean the board of governors, president, and academic vice-president, establish the mission and mandate, policies and procedures of the college, manage the resources and set the goals, and thereby shape the curriculum. The culture, norms, beliefs, values and philosophy emanate from their work, and implications of this inquiry suggest that they can do a great deal to establish the environment within which we take on more discipline specific curriculum development activity. I believe the foremost need is to ensure that faculty have a voice in these important areas that so profoundly affect the work we do. Ongoing commitment to collaborative governance is absolutely critical. Additionally, college wide areas of service, which offer direct support to instructors in the curriculum development role, need to be funded and accessible, and have clearly communicated information for instructors regarding their services. The use of a "learning commons" model, bringing essential curriculum and teaching resources together into an integrated service, can alleviate problems where even full-time experienced instructors have difficulty understanding working relationships between service areas, and part-time or newer instructors are lost in the maze. Leadership of these areas and services can and should create strong, positive, and open relationships with faculty, and would benefit from shared leadership including a strong faculty presence.

The position of dean represents the level of administration with the most direct contact with faculty members, and the most discipline oriented leadership not in a faculty role. As such, they are uniquely placed to create a strong linkage between higher levels of administration and leadership at the program and course level. Their central role creates an expectation that they clearly establish a flow of communication between levels which would enhance the understanding, at lower levels, of significant trends, impacts, and demands from the higher administration and from the community at large, and the expectation that they invite faculty participation and leadership in developing academic responses to those issues and opportunities. As the leader of a discipline based school within the college, the dean's role encompasses many of the decisions that have direct impact on the curriculum development role of an instructor, including, but not limited to,

appointing faculty members to positions, controlling resources that support teaching and curriculum development activities, facilitating faculty development initiatives and access, identifying curriculum, program development, and professional development and growth opportunities, and creating mechanisms and spaces for communication within the school and its respective programs. Each of these decision areas needs to be clearly directed toward the development of quality in education based on the stated philosophy and goals of the college – a difficult feat to achieve in turbulent and economically challenging times. Leadership that puts educational quality at the forefront of each decision, and invites collaborative participation by those involved, will make use of the rich resource faculty members and their curriculum development efforts represent in service of this goal, and will build trust and commitment amongst faculty members in their school.

As a faculty member with a formal leadership role, the program chair is perhaps the person with the most significant opportunity to have positive influence on the instructor-curriculum development relationship. The corollary is that the absence of good leadership in this role can have a devastating effect on the most skilled, willing and committed instructor, and their efforts to make quality oriented, meaningful change in the curriculum. The program chair wears many hats: instructor, curriculum leader, faculty member supervisor, program manager, and liaison to the larger college community. As such, their time and energies are divided, yet we need program chairs who are deeply committed to the curriculum development role and to the support of instructors as they accept the challenge of working with curriculum and making it their own. From the time of an instructor's first appointment to teach at the college, program chairs need to articulate and support curriculum development as "part of the job" regardless of the status of the appointment. They are first point of contact and source of information for new instructors, and key issues such as program philosophy and values, instructor role definition, expectations, and commitment, access to supports such as faculty development and instructional design, procedures of power and decision making, and opportunities for community and dialogue with colleagues are all critical information which must be shared in a timely and open manner. As the instructor becomes more experienced, the

program chair as leader needs to recognize and communicate opportunities for the instructor to grow into a more self-directed faculty member with access to the procedures of power to effect positive change in the curriculum. Given the complexity of the program chair role, this may sound like a daunting set of tasks and requirements indeed. In this they are fortunate, as the role is and should remain, focused on a "first among equals" philosophy and practice. The chair is often one of a number of instructors in a program, and as they accept the responsibilities of chairing the program, there needs to be recognition that the power and the responsibility of the role is best practiced with participatory leadership; the larger the program and more complex the task, the more they need to empower others to take on academic leadership in their own area of expertise.

I believe as an instructor I am responsible for accepting the challenge to invest in curriculum development, just as I accepted the role of instructor at this college, and I have an obligation to empower myself to carry out this responsibility. Certainly I look to other levels of leadership to support this challenge, but as an experienced member of this teaching community, I can play a leadership role not only by committing to the curriculum work, but by committing also to work collaboratively with others, both more and less experienced. This is, I think, a significant implication of this inquiry – that instructors firstly see, understand, and be able to articulate the curriculum development dimension of their role, and to gather such resources as needed to carry out that role. Yes, there are risks in committing to this level of investment, but the rewards far outstrip the risks. I am able to feel and shape the powerful connection I have with the curriculum, to know that I add meaning to the curriculum and its process, and to feel connected, not only to the discipline, but also to the community of learners who share it with me. Further, I am able to seek out, communicate with, learn alongside, demonstrate leadership and work in a community of practice made up of colleagues sharing this experience. I encourage others to consider accepting the challenge and rewards inherent in this deep commitment to curriculum development.

REFERENCES

Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development (1996). *Enhancing Alberta's adult learning system through technology: Policy, guidelines and procedures for the learning enhancement envelope*. Edmonton, AB. Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development.

Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development (1996). *Benchmarks for Alberta's post-secondary education system: A discussion paper*. Edmonton, AB. Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development.

Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development (1994). *Profile of adult learning in Alberta: Current context and selected trends affecting public post-secondary education and labour market training*. Edmonton, AB. Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development.

Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development (1994). *New directions for adult learning in Alberta*. Edmonton, AB.: Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development.

Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development (1992). *For all of our futures: Strategies for the future of post-secondary education in Alberta*. Edmonton, AB. Alberta Advanced Education and Career Development.

Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer. (2000). *Alberta transfer guide 2000-2001* (25th edition). Edmonton, AB: Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer.

Alberta Learning. (2003, May). *Learning and technology policy framework: draft for discussion only.*

Alberta Learning. (2001, May). *Statistical report on Alberta post-secondary education*. Retrieved November 26, 2001 from http://www.learning.gov.ab.ca/college/postsecsystem

Alberta Learning. (no date). *Post-secondary institutions*. Retrieved July 10, 2004 from http://www.learning.gov.ab.ca/college/postsecsystem/postsecinst/postsecinst.asp

Alfano, K. (1993). Recent strategies in faculty and staff development [24 paragraphs]. *Community College Review, 21* (1), 68 - 77. Retrieved August 24, 2001 from MasterFile Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Andrew, H. A. (2000). The dean and the faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 109*, 19 – 26.

Association of Canadian Community Colleges. (no date). *Colleges and Institutes: An introduction* Retrieved July 12, 2004 from http://www.accc.ca/english/colleges/index.cfm

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (no date). *AUCC Publications-Demand for university education continues to climb.* Retrieved January 12, 2005 from http://www.aucc.ca/publications/media/2004/11_03_e.html

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (no date). *AUCC Publications-Trends in higher education: Summary of findings.* Retrieved January 12, 2005 from http://www.aucc.ca/publications/auccpubs/research/trends/summary_e.html

Barnetson, R. (1999). A review of Alberta's performance based funding mechanism. *Quality in higher education, 5 (1),* 37 - 50.

Blades, D. W. (1997). *Procedures of power and curriculum change: Foucault and the quest for possibilities in science education.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Boone, E. J. (1985). *Developing programs in adult education.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bragg, D. D. (2002). Contemporary vocational models and programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 117,* 25 – 34.

Burnstad, H. M. (2002). Part-time faculty development at Johnson County Community College. *New Directions for Community College, no. 120,* 17 –25.

Caffarella, R. S. (2002). *Planning programs for adult learners: A practical guide for educators, trainers, and staff developers (2nd ed.).* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Chinien C. (2001a) *Program planning in adult education: Module 1, Unit 1 (unpublished course materials).* [26 paragraphs]. Winnipeg, Man.: University of Manitoba. Retrieved October 16, 2000 from WebCT course: http://www.umanitoba.ca/unevoc/

Chinien C. (2001b) *Program planning in adult education: Module 1, Unit 2 (unpublished course materials).* [28 paragraphs]. Winnipeg, Man.: University of Manitoba. Retrieved October 16, 2000 from WebCT course: http://www.umanitoba.ca/unevoc/

Clandinin, J. D. & Connelly, F. M. (1988). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (p. 150-178). Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

Clandinin, D. J & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Connelly, F. M. & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners.* Toronto: OISE Press/The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Costa, A. L. (1997). Curriculum: A decision-making process (abstract) [1 paragraph]. In A. L. Costa & R. M. Leibmann (Eds.) *Envisioning process as content: Toward a renaissance curriculum* (p. 41-49). Thousand Oaks, CA.:Corwin Press. Abstract retrieved August 17, 2001 from Academic Search Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Dennison, J. D. & Gallagher, P. (1986). *Canada's community colleges: A critical analysis.* Vancouver, BC. : University of British Columbia Press.

Doll, W. E. & Alcazar, A. (1998). Curriculum and concepts of control. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.) *Curriculum: Toward new identities.* New York, NY.: Garland Publishing Inc.

Erwin, J.S. (2000). The dean as chief academic officer. *New Directions for Community College, no. 109,* 9 – 17.

Foote, E. (1999). Staff and faculty development in community colleges [14 paragraphs]. *College Journal of Research and Practice,* 23(4). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from Academic Search Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Fugate, A. & Amey, M. (2000). Career stages of community college faculty: A qualitative analysis of the career paths, roles, and development [50 paragraphs]. *Community College Review,* 28 (1). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from MasterFile Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Gale, G. & Densmore, K. (2003). Democratic educational leadership in contemporary times. *International Journal of Leadership in Education,* vol. 2, 119 – 136.

Gibson-Harmon, K., Rodriguez, S., & Haworth, J. G. (2002). Community college faculty and professional staff: The human resource challenge. *New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 117,* 77 – 89.

Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Grant, M. R. & Keim, M. C. (2002). Faculty development at publicly supported two-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26,* 793 – 807.

Grant MacEwan College, Strategic Planning (2004, January) *What's going on out there?: An environmental scanning summary,* vol.5,1.

Hartwell, C. H. & Bryan, B. J. (2001). Curriculum development research: A literature guide. *Accounting Education, (10)* 3, 315-323.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of Organizational Behaviour.* Englewood,>N.J.:Prentice-Hall.

Houle, C. O. (1972). *The design of education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ivany, R. (2000). Economic development and a new millennium mandate for Canada's community colleges [32 paragraphs]. *College Canada, 5* (1). Retrieved August 24, 2001, from the World Wide Web: http://www.accc.ca/CollegeCanada/2000-5-1/EconomicDevelopment.htm

Kanter, M. J. (1994). Instructional programs. In A. M. Cohen, F. B. Brawer, & Associates (Eds.), *Managing community colleges* (p. 219-246). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kaupins, G. & Coco, M. (2002). Administrator perceptions of business school advisory boards. *Education*, vol 123, Issue 2, 351-358.

Langenbach, M. (1988). *Curriculum models in adult education.* Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing.

Levin, J. S. (2000). The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the twentieth century [45 paragraphs]. *Community College Review, 28* (2). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from MasterFile Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

MacKeracher, D. (1996). *Making sense of adult learning.* Toronto, ON: Culture Concepts.

March, J. G. & Weiner, S. S. (2003). Leadership blues. *New Directions for Community College, no. 123,* 5 – 14.

Marsh, C., Richards, K., and Smith, P. (2001). Autonomous learners and the learning society: Systematic perspectives on the practice of teaching in higher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* Vol. 33, Nos. 3 & 4.

Merriam, S. B. & Brockett, R. G. (1997). *The profession and practice of adult education: An introduction.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, B. J. (1983). *Introduction to Dacum: Dacum* 1 (abstract) [1 paragraph]. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press. Retrieved October 22, 2001 from ERIC: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Murray, J. (1998). Faculty development in New York two-year colleges [34 paragraphs]. *Community College Journal of Research & Practise, 22* (1). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from MasterFile Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Murray, J. (1999). Faculty development in a national sample of community colleges [41 paragraphs]. *Community College Review, 27*(3). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from MasterFile Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Murray, J. (2000). Faculty development in Texas two year colleges[36 paragraphs]. *Community College Journal of Research & Practise, 24* (4). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from MasterFile Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

O'Banion, T. (1997). The learning revolution: A guide for community college trustees. *Trustee Quarterly, 1*, 2 - 19.

Palmer, J. C. (1994). Educational planning and Assessment. In A. M. Cohen, F. B. Brawer, & Associates (Eds.), *Managing Community colleges* (pp. 457-474). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Petress, K. C. (2003). An educational philosophy guides the pedagogical process. *College Student Journal, vol. 37, no.1*, 128 –135.

Pisani, A. M. 7 Stott, N. (1998). An investigation of part-time faculty commitment to developmental advising. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 39, No. 2

Quick, D. (1999). Community college faculty development: Bringing technology into instruction [83 paragraphs]. *Community College Journal of Research & Practise, 23* (7). Retrieved August 17, 2001 from Academic Search Premier: http://www.lrc.gmcc.ab.ca/research/databases/

Ruhl, G. (1995). *Grant MacEwan Community College; The first two decades.* Edmonton, AB.: Grant MacEwan Community College.

Selman, M. (2001). Philosophical considerations. In D. H. Poonwassie & a. Poonwassie (Eds.), *Fundamentals of adult education: Issues and practices for lifelong learning* (p. 44 – 62). Thompson Educational Publishing: Toronto.

Selman, G., Cooke. M., Selman, M., & Dampier, P. (1991). *The foundations of adult education in Canada (2nd ed.).* Toronto, ON.: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Currency Doubleday.

Stark, J. S. & Lattuca, L. R. (1997). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in action.* Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Statistics Canada. (2003, February). *The changing profile of Canada's labour force* (Catalogue No. 96F0030XIE2001009). Ottawa: Author.

Valadez, J. R. & Anthony, J. S. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25,* 97-108.

Wallin, D L. (2003). Motivation and faculty development: A three-state study of presidential perceptions of faculty professional development needs. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 27,* 317-335.

Watts, G. E. & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Professional development: Setting the context. *New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 120,* 5 – 10.

Welch, G. F. (2002). A new faculty orientation program: Building a core of new faculty to shape the future of the college. *New Directions for Community College, no, 120,* 11 – 16.

APPENDIX A
LETTER OF CONSENT – PRIMARY PARTICIPANTS

(Participant Name)
(Address 1)
(Address 2)
(City, Province)

Dear (Participant Name),

I am a graduate student at the University of Alberta, and I am currently conducting a research study on college curriculum development as one of requirements for the degree of Philosophy Doctorate in Educational Policy Studies. I am inviting your participation in this study in your role as a college instructor.

The purpose of this study is to describe and reflect upon an individual experience of curriculum development and preparation to teach within a college. The significance of exploring the story of a college instructor's experience with curriculum development is not to suggest one best way to develop curriculum, nor to generalize about the efficacy of certain strategies, but rather to create and stimulate through the telling of stories that resonate amongst a community of readers interested in college curriculum and teaching. This is intended to spark a reflective learning process within the reader; college instructors may contemplate their own ways of creating a relationship to the curriculum they teach, perhaps reaffirming their own process of curriculum development, sharing the frustrations of others, or gaining insight on new strategies they may explore. The reader in other roles in the educational context may reflect upon the interface of their role with the process of curriculum development and teaching, including their contribution to these processes, or what choices might exist to do things differently.

Should you agree to participate in this study, your involvement would be to meet with me for approximately one hour a number of times (likely 5 or 6) over the next year to share the story of your experiences as you develop curriculum and prepare to teach on an ongoing basis, and to reflect on the stories of others. Each interview would be audio-taped and I would provide the transcription of the interview back to you for verification and reflection prior to our next meeting.

Participation in this study and the information gathered will be kept strictly confidential. No names of individual participants or other information that would specifically identify you will be released in any publication or discussion of this study. All data gathered in any format will be maintained in a secured file throughout the study, and for a minimum of 5 years following completion of the study. Any transcribers or other research assistants who may have access to the data will sign a confidentiality agreement, and all participant data will be assigned a pseudonym.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time. Any data that can be attributed directly to you will be removed from the study and returned to you should you choose to withdraw. You may, at any time throughout the study, choose to not answer a particular question or further a line of conversation or discussion. There are no foreseeable risks associated with your participation in this study.

.../over Page 2

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF CONSENT -

REFLECTIVE PARTICIPANTS

(Participant Name)
(Address 1)
(Address 2)
(City, Province)

Dear (Participant Name),

I am a graduate student at the University of Alberta, and I am currently conducting a research study on college curriculum development as one of requirements for the degree of Philosophy Doctorate in Educational Policy Studies. I am inviting your participation in this study in your role as a college instructor.

The purpose of this study is to describe and reflect upon an individual experience of curriculum development and preparation to teach within a college. The significance of exploring the story of a college instructor's experience with curriculum development is not to suggest one best way to develop curriculum, nor to generalize about the efficacy of certain strategies, but rather to create and stimulate through the telling of stories that resonate amongst a community of readers interested in college curriculum and teaching. This is intended to spark a reflective learning process within the reader; college instructors may contemplate their own ways of creating a relationship to the curriculum they teach, perhaps reaffirming their own process of curriculum development, sharing the frustrations of others, or gaining insight on new strategies they may explore. The reader in other roles in the educational context may reflect upon the interface of their role with the process of curriculum development and teaching, including their contribution to these processes, or what choices might exist to do things differently.

Should you choose to participate in the study, your involvement would be to meet with me for about one and a half hours (likely 2 or 3 times) over the next few months to reflect upon the shared story of an instructor colleague, to share the story of your experiences as you develop curriculum and prepare to teach on an ongoing basis, and to reflect on the stories of others. Each interview would be audio-taped and I would provide the transcription of the interview back to you for verification and reflection prior to our next meeting.

Participation in this study and the information gathered will be kept strictly confidential. No names of individual participants or other information that would specifically identify you will be released in any publication or discussion of this study. All data gathered in any format will be maintained in a secured file throughout the study, and for a minimum of 5 years following completion of the study. Any transcribers or other research assistants who may have access to the data will sign a confidentiality agreement, and all participant data will be assigned a pseudonym.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time. Any data that can be attributed directly to you will be removed from the study and returned to you should you choose to withdraw. You may, at any time throughout the study, choose to not answer a particular question or further a line of conversation or discussion. There are no foreseeable risks associated with your participation in this study.

.../over Page 2